

Nevada's 2003 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan—Open Project Selection Process



Skateboarding at Rattlesnake Park, Reno.

Photo courtesy Terry Zeller, Reno Parks, Recreation and Community Services.

**Nevada Division of State Parks
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Carson City, Nevada
March 2004**



The policy of the Nevada Division of State Parks is to fully comply with the intent of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI provides that no person in the United States shall, on grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participating in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The preparation of this plan was financed in part through a planning grant from the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (Public Law 88-578, as amended).



Nevada's 2003 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan—Open Project and Selection Process

By

**J. Stephen Weaver
And
James A. DeLoney**

**Under the Direction
of:**

Wayne Perock
Previous Administrator

David Morrow
Administrator

Nevada Division of State
Parks
Department of Conservation
and Natural Resources
Carson City, Nevada

November 2003

Elko Country. Photos courtesy Elko Convention and Visitor's Authority.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	iii
Introduction.....	1
Priority Rating Systems.....	1
Local Project Applications.....	1
State Funded Projects.....	2
Overview of Project Selection Process	3
Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources	3
L&WCF State Liaison Officer.....	3
Recurring Funding Cycle	4
Local Projects	4
State Projects.....	5
Public Notification	5
Program Technical Assistance.....	6
Affirmative Action	6
Advisory Boards.....	7
Public Participation	7
Authority and L&WCF Allocations.....	8
Authority for the Program.....	8
Fund Allocation	8
Local Project Selection Process	8
Phase I—Screening	8
Phase II—Evaluation	9
Phase III—Recommendations to the State Liaison Officer.....	10
Local Project Selection Criteria Explanations	10
General Planning Criteria	10
Criteria for the Proposed Project	13
Criteria for the Project Area.....	14
Administrative Criteria	18
Project Relationship with 2003 SCORP Issues	20
Appendix A: Nevada L&WCF Rating System Worksheet.....	27
Appendix B: Nevada L&WCF Grant Rating Criteria.....	29
Appendix C: Public Comments on the Draft 2003 OPSP	37
Public Comments on the Draft 2003 OPSP	38
NDSP Drafting of the 2003 OPSP	38
Five OPSP Public Meetings.....	38
Comments From the Five Public Meetings	40
Applying the 2003 OPSP	49
Appendix D: 2003 OPSP Public Meeting Invitees	51
Appendix E: 2003 OPSP Public Meetings Attendance Roster	59
Appendix F: Samples of 2003 OPSP Public Meeting Materials.....	61

Introduction

The 1965 Land and Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) Act was established with the intent for state and local government entities to share in the funds allocated by Congress each year to the L&WCF program. The Nevada State Legislature granted the Administrator of the Nevada Division of State Parks the authority to administer the Land and Water Conservation Fund program for the State of Nevada. Accordingly, the Nevada Division of State Parks administers the program for Nevada. Traditionally, Nevada's policy has been to split its allocation 50:50 between the state and its various political subdivisions, including Native American tribal governments, after planning costs are subtracted.

Drastic fluctuations in the "stateside" L&WCF funding over the years have made it difficult or impossible for states to maintain a viable grants program and a viable SCORP planning process as required by federal requirements for states to participate in the L&WCF Program. States received no L&WCF funding from Congress in 1982 and from 1995-1999. In FY 2000, states received \$40 million. In FY 2001, the Interior Appropriations Bill included provisions known as Title VIII, Land Conservation, Preservation and Infrastructure Improvement (LCPII). LCPII authorized stateside funding for the L&WCF program for each of the following six years (2001-2006). Actual appropriations included \$89 million for "stateside" L&WCF grants in federal fiscal year 2001, \$140 million in FY 2002, and \$95 million in FY 2003. Presumably, funding will continue for at least the next several years.

One requirement for states to maintain their eligibility to receive L&WCF monies is maintenance of an approved "Open Project Selection Process" (OPSP). The Division of State Parks developed the previous OPSP as an addendum to the 1992 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). With the completion of the 2003 SCORP update, the OPSP must be revised to reflect the current SCORP.

The 2003 OPSP document incorporates criteria and standards that address the eight major recreation issues described in the 2003 SCORP and related surveys conducted to establish these issues. In addition, the 2003 OPSP was developed in accordance with the National Park Service requirements cited in the OPSP section of the **L&WCF Grants-in-Aid Manual**.

Priority Rating Systems

Local Project Applications

Upon notification by the National Park Service of annual stateside L&WCF allocations, the Division of State Parks solicits applications for proposed projects from political subdivisions across the state, including Native American tribal governments. Any political subdivisions that respond to the initial announcement are sent an application

package that includes a handbook (grants manual) with basic information about the grant program, application forms, deadline notice, and accompanying instructions. The application package is also available in the two most popular electronic formats for computer downloading from the Division of State Parks' website.

The criteria used to score and rank local projects are designed to directly address the eight major outdoor recreation issues identified in the 2003 SCORP facing park and recreation providers at all levels of government in Nevada. The Division of State Parks uses these criteria to achieve a coherent and consistent policy for the expenditure of these funds to all applicants, and to make sure that the OPSP is based on findings presented in the SCORP.

The criteria and rating process are the focus of this document. The rating worksheet developed to process local acquisition and development projects ensure that the selection of competing projects for funding is fair and equitable, and that projects are funded based on their relative merits. State Parks staff drafted this rating system.

The staff then conducted five public meetings across Nevada in March and April of 2003 to obtain public input to revise the draft document. Public meetings were held in Las Vegas on March 21; in Reno on March 27; in Carson City on April 4; in Ely on April 7, and in Elko on April 8. The draft document was revised after each of the first three meetings. The revised versions were used to conduct the subsequent meetings. Final revisions to develop the draft were made after the Ely and Elko meetings. Twenty-one people attended the five public meetings. Approximately 160 people were mailed notices to attend the five public meetings. Notices announcing the public meetings were posted at the NDSP Headquarters in Carson City, at the NDSP Regional Offices, the DCNR Headquarters in Carson City, and other sites around the state. The announcement was also posted on the NDSP website.

The revised draft was made available to local recreation providers in Nevada for their comment and review. The draft was posted on the NDSP website. Hard copies were mailed upon request. The draft was revised based on the comments received. After the final revision, the draft was submitted to the National Park Service for acceptance.

The rating system and project criteria reflect the extent to which project proposals conform to the eligibility criteria outlined in the National Park Service's Grants-in-Aid Manual, the demonstrated need for the project as determined by local needs analyses, the 8 major recreation issues identified in the 2003 SCORP, and the findings of the supporting 2001 and 2002 public recreation surveys.

State Funded Projects

Aside from any funds allocated for SCORP planning and the administration of the grants program, the Division of State Parks uses its share of the federal funds on projects which directly benefit visitors to Nevada State Parks. The criteria used to recommend Nevada State Parks' projects for funding also focus on the eight major recreational issues

identified in the 2003 SCORP. Additional criteria may also be used to encourage the rehabilitation of existing facilities and the development of new facilities in areas where demand is demonstrably high.

Overview of Project Selection Process

The Nevada Division of State Parks' L&WCF Grants Coordinator performs a detailed review of each local project submitted in response to the initial solicitation/notification. The criteria for this review segment of the selection process have been developed by the Division, and are explained in detail in this document. State park projects are processed independently from and do not compete with local projects.

The Nevada Division of State Parks' L&WCF Grants Coordinator submits recommendations to the NDSP Park and Recreation Program Manager and the NDSP Chief of Planning and Development for review and comment. These reviews are completed before the recommendations are presented to the Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR).

The criteria used to process local and state park projects are designed to address the 8 major issues facing park and recreation providers in Nevada that are identified in the 2003 SCORP. This process serves a two-fold purpose. First, the state is able to implement a consistent policy for the expenditure of funds. Second, fund managers can be assured that there is a clear-cut connection between the criteria used to select L&WCF projects and the issues identified in the SCORP.

Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources

After processing by the NDSP staff, local projects are presented to the Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR) for review and recommendations. The NABNR is a citizen advisory committee that provides citizen oversight and scrutiny of staff recommendations for project selection. Accordingly, the NABNR has the authority to make recommendations inconsistent with staff recommendations or project scoring priorities. State park projects are not subjected to this process, nor are they submitted to the NABNR for review and recommendations. Instead, state park projects require administrative and legislative authorization.

L&WCF State Liaison Officer

The **L&WCF Grants** Manual states in Chapter 600.1.3 that "To be eligible for assistance under the L&WCF Act, the Governor of each State shall designate in writing an official who has authority to represent and act for the State as the State Liaison Officer in dealing with the Director of NPS for purposes of the L&WCF program. The State Liaison Officer (SLO) shall have authority and responsibility to accept and to administer funds paid for approved projects. Upon taking office, a new Governor shall officially, in

writing, redesignate the present State Liaison Officer or appoint a new individual to represent and act for the State in dealing with the L&WCF program.” On December 16, 2003, Governor Guinn appointed Steve Weaver, Chief of Planning and Development, Nevada Division of State Parks to serve as the SLO for Nevada. The NABNR project recommendations are forwarded to the State Liaison Officer (SLO). The SLO makes the final determination for project selection and level of funding, and forwards the eligible projects to the Director of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and then to the Governor's Office before recommending projects to the National Park Service for final funding approval.

Recurring Funding Cycle

Nevada's L&WCF Grants Program is administered on an annual cycle. The cycle begins each year when the Secretary of the Interior issues the notice of apportionment to the governor. This notification identifies the amount of funds which will be made available to Nevada for the L&WCF grant program.

Local Projects

The following funding schedule for local programs has been developed with the assumption that the state will be notified of its annual apportionment by December, following the October beginning of the federal government's fiscal year. If notification is received later, the schedule will be delayed accordingly.

- December—A public notice is sent to over 150 local political subdivisions in Nevada, including all applicable county and city entities, and Native American tribal governments. The notice will inform them that applications for the current fiscal year will be accepted until the deadline, which occurs about 90 days from the date of notification.
- January 31—Application packages, including the Nevada L&WCF Grants Manual, are sent upon request to all respondents to the initial notification (April 15 for FY ‘03).
- March 31—Deadline for submission of current fiscal year applications to the Nevada Division of State Parks (June 30 for FY ‘03).
- April—Applications are reviewed, analyzed, evaluated, and rated per the rating worksheet at Appendix A. The Division’s L&WCF Grants Coordinator inspects the proposed project sites.
- May—Project recommendations are made to the Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR) for consideration and to the State Liaison Officer (SLO).

- July—NABNR project recommendations and comments are made available to the SLO, who makes a list of successful projects for available funds.
- August 1—SLO submits list of recommended projects to the National Park Service for funding approval. All applicants are notified of the status of their respective project applications.
- September—Applicants are notified by State Parks about final approval of grant applications by NPS; funding agreements are initiated.

This approximate schedule gives local applicants at least 90 days from the first notice of the availability of funding in which to prepare and submit complete applications.

State Park Projects

The Chief of Planning and Development, NDSP, is responsible for the development and submission of the NDSP projects. The Chief of Planning and Development develops the NDSP projects in consultation with the NDSP field staff, the Planning and Development staff, the Chief of Park Operations, and the NDSP Administrator. State park projects only require administrative and legislative authorization, and are not submitted to the NABNR for review and recommendations.

Currently, the Chief of Planning and Development serves as Nevada's SLO. As the Chief of Planning and Development, he selects state projects for submittal to the NDSP Administrator for approval. After the NDSP Administrator approves the state park projects, the NABNR is apprised of the state park project selections as an information only agenda item. Following approvals by the NDSP Administrator and the SLO, the Division's L&WCF Grants Coordinator forwards the SLO's recommendations to the National Park Service for final approval.

Public Notification

Each year that L&WCF grants have been available to Nevada, the Division of State Parks has notified the local political subdivisions in Nevada as potential applicants about the grants and encouraged them to participate in the grants program. Over 150 announcements with an informational brochure are mailed to all county and city governments, improvement districts, park and recreation districts, and tribal governments that have the authority and responsibility for acquiring and developing park and recreation facilities. In addition to notifying potential applicants on the Division's mailing list, approximately 20 board and committee members of the Nevada Park & Recreation Society are notified. Anyone else interested in the L&WCF Program in Nevada may find the information posted on the Nevada Division of State Parks website. The announcements include the application schedule, deadline, and anticipated date of notification of approved or selected projects.

Recipients of the initial announcement may request an application packet. Upon receipt of a request, State Parks' staff sends the requestor an application packet comprised of:

- (1) A brief description of the L&WCF program (including the amount of funds available);
- (2) Application forms;
- (3) A Nevada L&WCF Grants Manual (including the criteria for evaluating and rating projects, and an explanation of how the funds will be distributed) for prospective applicants who are unable to download from the Division's website; and
- (4) A summary of any changes to the grants program since the last application period.

Program Technical Assistance

Technical assistance is available to all L&WCF applicants through the Nevada Division of State Parks. First, the NDSP staff will make every effort possible to answer questions regarding application procedures, the proper completion of these grant applications, and the criteria used for project selection and grant awards.

Second, the Division of State Parks makes available the latest revision of the Nevada Land & Water Conservation Fund Grants Manual to all local political subdivisions. This manual is placed on the Division's website or sent, upon request, to all respondents to the initial notice of funding availability. Included in the document is a detailed description of the application procedures and a sample of the rating worksheet found in the 2003 edition of the Open Project Selection Process (see Appendix A).

Third, the Division maintains a comprehensive mailing list of all potentially eligible applicants. This list includes the names and addresses of political subdivisions throughout the state who have jurisdictional responsibility for recreation, or who may have a related interest in recreational development. Included on this list are the names of special interest groups, professional and community organizations, and others who have expressed an interest in the L&WCF program. All of these individuals and groups are contacted and invited to submit applications.

Affirmative Action

Throughout the 2003 OPSP development, representatives from minority, senior, disabled, youth and user groups throughout the state were invited to participate in the process. Examples include: Governor's Committee on Employment of People w/ Disabilities, Carson Youth Leadership Program, Hispanic Youth Image, Nevada Office of Veteran's Services, Business and Industry Director's office, National Latino Peace Officers Association, the Nevada Department of Human Services Rehabilitation Division, and 24 Nevada Indian tribes.

The Division will continue to contact these individuals and groups whenever grant applications are sought, or when significant changes are made to the grant program. In addition, the Division will continue to add representatives of any pertinent special populations and special interest groups to its mailing list on an ongoing basis whenever their names and address become available, so that they can contact eligible entities to submit applications on their behalf.

Advisory Boards

Although the use of advisory boards is not required, the National Park Service encourages them. The DRAFT OPSP is submitted to the Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR). In addition, the NABNR reviews staff recommendations for project selection and may comment to confirm or modify recommendations sent to the State Liaison Officer before final selection.

Many political subdivisions have their own advisory boards, several of which include minority representation. The Division of State Parks encourages the involvement of these advisory boards in selecting project applications submitted for funding.

Public Participation

Federal guidelines require that the state's Open Project Selection Process include opportunities for public participation before implementation. Public participation is required to assure that the preparation and revision of the selection process and rating systems are based on citizen involvement and public participation, including minority participation. In Nevada, public involvement in determining the project selection process was made in three ways.

First, public participation throughout the SCORP planning process was instrumental in determining the 8 major outdoor recreational issues which are a significant part of the selection process and rating worksheet for state and local projects. A mail survey was conducted of 1,500 randomly selected individuals age 16 years or greater. The response rate for this citizen's survey was 54%. The citizen's survey was followed by input from 132 individuals selected to participate in six issues and actions surveys to develop and prioritize the recreation issues and actions described in the 2003 SCORP. The survey technique for these six surveys utilized a modified Delphi process.

Secondly, five public workshops were held around the state in March and April of 2003 in the cities of Las Vegas, Reno, Carson City, Elko, and Ely in accordance with the state's open meeting law. Announcements of the workshops were mailed to over 155 potential participants, including the list established for the annual LWCF grant announcements. A total of 21 persons participated in the five public workshops. These five public

workshops were followed by a brief period for submittal of written comments by meeting participants.

Thirdly, an opportunity for public participation took place during the Advisory Board review phase of the OPSP development. The NABNR agenda was announced publicly in accordance with the state's open meeting law. The meeting agenda included provisions for public comments on the draft OPSP document.

Authority And L&WCF Allocations

Authority for the Program

Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 407.207 allows the Division of State Parks, as a representative of state agencies and political subdivisions, to apply for federal funds for any program concerning outdoor recreation, including the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Further, NRS 407.205 permits the administrator of the Division to accept, administer and disburse to other state agencies and political subdivisions grant monies furnished by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada as financial assistance for the planning, acquisition, or development of outdoor recreation projects.

Fund Allocation

Currently, it is the policy of the State of Nevada that, after the subtraction of planning costs, 50% of the remaining L&WCF dollars allocated to Nevada will be distributed each year to political subdivisions on a competitive basis. In conformance with the OPSP, the specific allocations will be determined, in part, upon the 8 major issues outlined in the 2003 SCORP update and appropriate National Park Service regulations, applicable state legislation, and selection criteria adopted by the OPSP.

Local Project Selection Process

The Division of State Parks L&WCF Coordinator shall evaluate all projects submitted by local agencies. The evaluation process is comprised of two phases—Phase I-Screening, Phase II-Evaluation, and Phase III-Recommendations to the State Liaison Officer.

Phase I—Screening

The first phase of the local project selection process is to determine the project's eligibility for further consideration and possible funding selection. The project must meet the eligibility requirements of the L&WCF Act and criteria established by the National Park Service, and be consistent with the recreational issues as identified in the SCORP.

An eligible project application shall meet the following requirements:

1. Project applications shall be completed and submitted to the Nevada Division of State Parks for receipt by 5:00 P.M. on the date of the deadline. Project applications received after 5:00 P.M. on the date of the deadline will be declined without further actions to process the application. Project sponsors will be notified of the ineligibility.
2. Project applications shall identify an established source of eligible matching funds to meet the non-federal share of the project cost by the application deadline.
3. Prospective grantees must have funds to cover a one time administrative fee to be assessed to all grant award recipients by the State for LWCF program administration.

For development projects, applicants must show they have adequate control and tenure for project lands (actual project site and lands within 6(f)(3) boundary lands) included in their project proposal. Adequate control and tenure is demonstrated by:

1. Fee simple ownership of all the project lands, without any encumbrances which will prevent the land from being fully used as specified in the project proposal; or
2. A lease from the Federal government for 25 years or more (though some time on the lease may be elapsed); or
3. A lease from one public agency to another for 25 years or more, provided that safeguards are included to adequately meet the perpetual outdoor recreation use requirement contained in the L&WCF Act. Such safeguards may include joint sponsorship of the proposed project or other agreement whereby the lessor would assume compliance responsibility for the grant-assisted area in the event of the default by the lessee or expiration of the lease.

Phase II—Evaluation

Projects screened and found to warrant further consideration will be scored and ranked by the Division of State Parks' L&WCF Grants Coordinator in accordance with the criteria incorporated into the Rating Worksheet at Appendix A. The total score awarded to each project will determine rankings. Projects with the highest total scores that fall within the available L&WCF moneys will be recommended for funding.

The cutoff on the list of eligible projects recommended for funding will be determined by the amount of federal L&WCF moneys available. If the last project on the list can only be partially funded, the SLO will be consulted and the Division will ask the local sponsor(s) if they are willing to reduce the project scope to fit within the available funds. If the project sponsor does not wish to reduce the scope, then the project will be removed from the list of projects recommended for funding for the year. With the sponsor's concurrence, the project will be placed on the list of eligible projects the following year for preferential funding consideration. The project ranked next on the list shall be selected and subjected to the same process. The process will be repeated until a project is found for which the available funds can be used.

Phase III - Recommendations to the State Liaison Officer

Having completed Phases I and II above, the Division's L&WCF Grants Coordinator provides a summary of project descriptions, scoring, and other applicable materials to the NABNR for review and recommendations. After a properly agendaed and announced meeting, the NABNR will subsequently make their recommendations for approval, denial or modification of staff recommendations to the State Liaison Officer (SLO) as soon as practicable.

The SLO makes the final selection of projects to be awarded grant funds and establishes the program for project inspection and payment. Although the SLO will typically agree with the NABNR's recommendations, he/she is not obligated to concur and can change priorities so that the list of projects to be funded is not entirely consistent with the NABNR's recommendations. Projects selected by the SLO are forwarded to the National Park Service's Western Regional Office in Oakland, California for final approval.

Local Project Selection Criteria Explanations

The scoring criteria utilized with the rating worksheet covers criteria in five general subject areas. These criteria are described in detail below. The criteria are presented in the same order that they appear on the rating worksheet. Comments about higher or lower scores relate only to that criterion, not the overall score a project may receive. It is virtually impossible for any project to be awarded the total maximum number of points found in the scoring criteria. Until all the project applications are evaluated, scored, and ranked, it is not possible to predict which projects will be recommended for funding.

A. GENERAL PLANNING CRITERIA (-9 to +40 Points Possible)

1. Project Use & Design (0 to +15)

(Score each of the following):

- a. *The degree to which the project design enhances the existing surroundings.*

Score 0 to +5

The project should fit in with the surroundings. For example, walking trails in a neighborhood might be highly desired while motorized trails may not be compatible with the neighborhood.

- b. *Degree to which the project provides accessibility for persons with disabilities.*

Score 0 to +5

All facilities should be accessible to persons with disabilities if possible.

Examples are parking lots, trailheads, water fountains, picnic tables, campsites, and restroom facilities. All facilities are not required to be ADA accessible. Examples include walking or hiking trails in difficult terrain.

Portions of trails should be accessible where possible, however.

- c. *Degree to which the project will provide features attractive to populations with special recreation requirements (i.e. senior citizens, youth, disabled persons, minorities, etc.).*

Score 0 to +5

Special populations such as senior citizens engage in outdoor recreation activities preferable to that age group. For example, senior citizens may prefer less physically demanding outdoor recreation activities, such as walking rather than soccer or football. Many senior citizens do engage in vigorous activities as long as their physical abilities permit them to do so. Youth may prefer activities than adults may have little or interest in, such as skateboarding at skateboard parks. Minorities often have preferences for outdoor recreation activities. For example, Hispanics are often more likely to participate in family oriented activities at local parks, such as picnicking, than other population groups.

2. *Environmental Considerations*

-5 to +5

Degree to which the proposed project impacts the natural environment negatively, mitigates environmental impacts or enhances the environment.

A project that creates a negative impact on the natural environment will be assessed a negative score of -1 to -5. A project that neither enhances nor negatively impacts the natural environment will be given a 0 score. Projects that mitigate or enhance will receive a positive score of +1 to +5, depending on the level and effectiveness of the mitigation.

3. *Competitive Impact*

-5 to 0

Degree to which the proposed project will compete with private facilities.

L&WCF projects should not compete with facilities developed and administered by the private sector. Funding public outdoor recreation projects with tax dollars places an unfair burden on privately owned outdoor recreation enterprises. The intent of the L&WCF Grants Program is to improve the quality and quantity of public outdoor recreation opportunities in Nevada, not to duplicate existing opportunities already provided by the private sector. Projects that would create a competitive situation with private enterprises will be assigned a negative score of -1 to -5 for this criterion, especially if they provide similar facilities, offer similar services and/or cater to the same clientele as competing private provider(s).

Projects that do not compete with the private sector will be given a score of 0. It is recognized that public parks and recreation areas may compliment the private sector. For example, visitors may be attracted to parks and recreation areas that do not have overnight or eating accommodations. Therefore, the same visitors may patronize nearby private camping areas or lodging facilities and eat in private restaurants.

4. *Ability to Satisfy Basic Outdoor Recreation Needs*

+1 to +10

(Requires written documentation of needs. Choose one.):

- a. *Project will provide needed facilities where none now exist.*

Score +7 to +10

Projects that provide needed facilities where no outdoor recreation facilities currently exist will be awarded a score for this criterion of +7 to +10. The idea is to get needed facilities in communities that have no outdoor recreation opportunities. Providing opportunities in areas completely void of opportunities is the highest priority.

- b. *Project will provide needed facilities where the particular type of facility proposed does not exist.*

Score +4 to +6

Once every community or area has outdoor recreation opportunities, the next priority is to improve the mix of those opportunities. For example, a community may have a picnic area but no softball fields. A project proposing a needed softball field may be awarded a score of +4 to +6 for this criterion.

- c. *Project will augment existing facilities where they are insufficient to meet existing needs.*

Score +1 to +3

Communities or areas may have outdoor recreation facilities but the quantity is not sufficient to meet the demand. For example, a community may have one softball field but actually needs two fields to accommodate the softball teams assigned to leagues in the area. A project of this type could receive a score of +1 to +3 for this criterion.

The need for recreation lands and/or facilities varies considerably from one locale to another. Generally, those localities which have no existing facilities or in which existing facilities are grossly deficient in quality or quantity will be favored over other areas where basic recreation needs are more or less being met.

5. ***Local Land Use, Zoning & Planning Considerations:*** *Degree to which the proposed project is consistent with local land uses, land use plans and zoning.*

Score 0 to +5

Although all projects must comply with local plans and zoning laws and regulations, the degree of compliance may vary. The more consistent a project is with local land uses, land use plans and zoning, the higher the score that will be awarded.

6. ***Public Participation in Project Planning:*** *Degree to which the project proposal has involved members of the public in the planning process.*

Score 0 to +5

Projects that demonstrate public involvement during the planning phase (through workshops, input during planning commission meetings, opportunities for written comments, letters of endorsement from political subdivisions or civic

organizations, etc.) will be ranked higher than projects in which the public was not involved or supportive of the planning process.

B. CRITERIA FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT (+2 to +35 Points Possible)

1. Demand for Facility 0 to +10 Points

Based on evidence supplied with pre-award discussion, project proposal, public preference or participation surveys, demand/supply analyses, current use figures at similar facilities, other locally generated statistics, planning documentation, or other documented justification (Choose one).

- | | |
|-----------|-----------|
| a. High | +8 to +10 |
| b. Medium | +4 to +7 |
| c. Low | 0 to +3 |

Projects with evidence of demand for specified facilities, such as a public preference survey, recreation participation survey, supply/demand analysis, existing site use statistics, current use figures at similar nearby facilities, public workshops, master plans developed through a public input forum or other documented evidence will be given preference over projects with weak or lack of such evidence.

2. Multiple-Use Considerations: +1 to +5 Points

Project will provide multiple-use opportunities involving (Choose one):

- | | |
|--|----|
| a. More than four recreational opportunities | +5 |
| b. At least four recreational activities | +4 |
| c. At least three recreational activities | +3 |
| d. At least two recreational activities | +2 |
| e. Only a single use recreational activity | +1 |

The more recreational activities a development project will provide for, the higher it will score on this criterion. A project that would provide for five or more outdoor recreation activities would receive a score of +5. A project proposing to construct a multi-use field designed to accommodate soccer, football, and softball would score +3. A field designed to accommodate soccer and football would score +2. Projects that only accommodate a single outdoor recreation activity, such as a skateboard park, will be rated lowest with a score of +1.

3. Land ownership: (Choose one) 0 to +10 Points

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| a. Fee simple or permanent easement | +10 |
| b. Lease or more than 60 years | +7 |
| c. Lease of 31-60 years | +5 |
| d. Lease of 26-30 years | +3 |
| e. Lease of 25 years | 0 |
| f. Lease less than 25 years | INELIGIBLE |

Development projects which have fee simple title, permanent easements, or a long-term lease of the project property will be ranked above those which have shorter term leases. Lease terms under 25 years are ineligible.

4. Seasonal Use (Choose one): +1 to +5

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| a. 4 seasons | +5 |
| b. 3 seasons | +4 |
| c. 2 seasons | +3 |
| d. 1 season | +1 |

Projects which permit year around use will rank above those which can only be utilized part of the year. Single season facilities will be ranked lowest. For example, a trail may accommodate walking, jogging, and hiking in the warmer seasons and snow-related activities during the winter seasons, allowing for year round use. A tennis court would be generally unusable during winter months in the northern part of the state, and therefore would not receive credit for 4 seasons.

5. Creativity and Originality: 0 to +5 Points

Degree to which project demonstrates creative solutions and/or originality in design (i.e., alternative energy provisions, low maintenance features, multiple-use provisions, etc.), and shows potential for applications to other projects.

Of particular interest are projects that propose innovations or creative solutions with potential applications to other projects in the future. Projects with such creativity will receive a higher rating than those that demonstrate little or no creativity or originality.

C. CRITERIA FOR THE PROJECT AREA (+3 to +65 Points Possible)

1. Proximity to Population Centers: (Score a, b, and c below): 0 to +20 Points

- a. Will project protect or enhance scarce natural or cultural resources near population centers (communities > 1,000 population) and/or heavy use areas?

If Yes → +5 to +10
If No → 0

- b. *Will project provide or enhance recreation opportunities in or near population centers (communities > 1,000 population) that have (Choose one)*
 - (1) *No recreational facilities* +10
 - (2) *Severe shortage of recreational facilities* +8
 - (3) *Moderate shortage of recreational facilities* +6
 - (4) *Slight shortage of recreational facilities* +3
 - (5) *Adequate recreational facilities* 0
- c. *Will project provide or enhance recreational opportunities in rural areas (populations < 1,000) that have (Choose one):*
 - (1) *No recreational facilities* +5
 - (2) *Severe shortage of recreational facilities* +4
 - (3) *Moderate shortage of recreational facilities* +3
 - (4) *Slight shortage of recreational facilities* +2
 - (5) *Adequate recreational facilities* 0

Projects that will protect or enhance scarce natural or cultural resources threatened by non-compatible development or urban encroachment will be given priority by the first part of this criterion. Similarly, projects which will provide or enhance recreational opportunities in proximity to urbanized areas, especially where facilities are most lacking, will be given preference over similar projects in less populated areas.

2. *Service Area Served by Project: +2 to +10 Points*

- a. *Statewide* +10
- b. *Regional (multi-county)* +8
- c. *County-wide* +6
- d. *Local community* +4
- e. *Neighborhood* +2

In general, the broader the service area of a particular project site, the higher it will fare under this criteria. Projects that serve a statewide constituency will be given the highest rating, while those which serve a very localized or neighborhood population will score lowest under this criterion.

3. *Anticipated Use of Facility +1 to +5 Points*

(Based on number of visitors anticipated on an annual basis—choose one):

- a. *High* 100,000 or more +5
- b. *Medium-High* 75,000 to 99,999 +4
- c. *Medium* 50,000 to 74, 999 +3
- d. *Medium-Low* 10,000 to 49,999 +2
- e. *Low* Less than 10,000 +1

Similar to the project service area criteria, projects which serve larger populations should score better than those that serve a smaller population. Specific projects that will serve in excess of 100,000 people per year will receive the highest score, while those serving less than 10,000 will receive a lower score.

4. *Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships 0 to +15 Points*

(Check all that apply. Score 3 points per entity, up to a max of +15):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement District |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State | <input type="checkbox"/> Unincorporated Community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> County | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Profit Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Town or City | <input type="checkbox"/> Organized User Group |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School District | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify _____) |

The relative degree of inter-agency and/or public-private cooperation or partnerships will be weighed; multiple partnerships will take precedence over single entity sponsors with no partnerships. Partnerships may consist of management/operational agreements, funding relationships, volunteered labor, sponsorships, donated equipment or materials, etc.

5. *Economically Depressed Community Status: 0 to +15 Points*

Compare the average household income or the average unemployment rate of the project service area with the countywide or statewide economic data, whichever is appropriate.

This particular criterion awards economically depressed communities with points for grant awards over communities with stronger economies. Determine the economic status by comparing economic factors for the project service area with countywide or statewide economic factors using the following methodology:

First, the project sponsor shall determine the size of the project area. If the project will service a small community within a county, compare the project service area with county statistics. If the project service area is comprised of an entire county or larger area, compare the project service area with statewide economic statistics.

Second, the project sponsor must determine which economic factor to use to make the comparison. The two economic factors that may be used to make this comparison are the average household income and the average unemployment rate. Use only one of the two economic factors to make the comparison.

Average household Income. Use the U.S. Census Bureau census block data to compare the average household income for the project service area with countywide or statewide data. The U.S. Census Bureau has not yet released the 2000 census block (groups) data. Until the 2000 data is released, use the 1990 Census data. The website to find the U.S. Census data is <http://factfinder.census.gov>, or <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>.

Project sponsors may use other sources of economic data to make the average household income comparison, such as a recent statistically valid local income survey, data provided by the Nevada State Demographer, or other pertinent data

available to the project sponsor. The project sponsor is responsible to conduct the research to locate available data, perform the data analysis, present the data, and cite the data source in the project application.

Unemployment Rate. A project service area may be economically depressed due to high unemployment. For example, if a major industry closes in the service area, the unemployment rate may increase substantially. If the project sponsor can document a high unemployment rate, points may be awarded for this criterion accordingly. Sources acceptable for the unemployment data for the project service area are the same as cited under average household income above.

Awarding Points. The maximum points awarded cannot exceed 15 points. Only one method can be used. Points will be awarded as follows.

- (1) *Average Household Income:* Projects with service areas, determined by the project sponsor, with an average household income of 80% or less of the county or statewide median, whichever comparison is appropriate, will be awarded 15 points for this criterion.
- (2) *Unemployment Rate:* Project service areas with an unemployment rate 50% higher than the county or statewide median, whichever comparison is appropriate, will be awarded 15 points.

Partial credit. An applicant may receive partial credit for the economically depressed community status scoring criterion if a portion of the service area is economically depressed. For example, if the service area is comprised of an entire county, and a portion of the county's average household income is less than the statewide average household income, points will be awarded based on that percentage.

Examples.

Average Household Income:

- (1) If 60% of the service area meets the economically depressed community criteria, then the project would receive 60% of 15 points, or 9 points.
- (2) If the project service area is an entire county, and the entire county meets the economically depressed community criteria, then the project would be awarded 15 points.

Unemployment Rate:

- (1) If the project area is a small community or neighborhood, and has an unemployment rate 60% higher than the statewide unemployment rate, the project will be awarded 60% of the 15 points, or 9 points.
- (2) If the statewide unemployment rate is 6% and the unemployment rate for the project area is 9%, then the project will be awarded 15 points.
(6%-9% = -3%. 3%/6% = -50%).

D. ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA (-50 to +65)

1. Previous L&WCF Project History: -30 to +15

- a. *Has sponsor ever received a L&WCF grant?*
If yes, go to b. If No, award +15 points → then go to 4.
- b. *Has sponsor received a L&WCF grant within the last 15 years?*
If yes, go to c. If No, award +10 points → then go to 2.
- c. *Has sponsor received a L&WCF grant within the last 5 years?*
If No → go to 2
If yes, were previous project(s) awarded the sponsor over last 5 years? (Choose one)
 - (1) *Completed prior to original deadlines* +10
 - (2) *Completed within 1-12 months past original deadlines* +5
 - (3) *Completed > 12 months past original deadlines* 0
 - (4) *Canceled due to non performance* -5 to -1
- d. *Previous 5 year record for general project administration (no history = 0) -5 to +5*
- e. *Preceding Grant Cycle—project sponsor was awarded L&WCF grant(s) during immediately preceding grant cycle with a composite total amount of (Choose one)*
 - (1) *\$250,000 or more* -20
 - (2) *\$200,000 up to \$249,999* -15
 - (3) *\$100,000 up to \$199,999* -10
 - (4) *Less than \$100,000* -5
 - (5) *Did not receive grant in previous cycle* 0

Political subdivisions that have never received a L&WCF grant will be given preference over previous recipients. Likewise, political subdivisions that have not received a L&WCF grant within the last 15 years will be given preferences over more recent recipients. Previous recipients of L&WCF grants will be assessed based on their past performance in administering and implementing the grants awarded. Project sponsors with a favorable project completion record will be given preference over sponsors with less satisfactory records. Sponsors with a good record of compliance with L&WCF project administration obligations will be given preference over those with poorer records. Finally, sponsors that received an LWCF grant during the immediately preceding grant cycle will be assigned lower priority scoring graduated by the amounts received.

2. Operations and Maintenance

-10 to +10

Record of sponsor's performance during the last 5 years in operating and maintaining existing facilities is an indicator of ability and commitment to adequately operate and maintain future L&WCF program funded facilities.

Another measure of past sponsor performance is a sponsor's operations and maintenance record during the previous five years. A meritorious record indicates a sponsor's ability and commitment to adequately operate and maintain additional LWCF program funded project(s). Assessment of a sponsor's operation and maintenance record to score this criterion will only go back five years. All long-term maintenance requirements will remain in effect, however.

3. Post Completion Inspections Compliance (Choose one)

+5 to +10

- a. *Sponsor complied with obligations to provide 5-year self-inspections of previously funded L&WCF projects prior to submission of application* +10
- b. *Sponsor was not in compliance prior to submitting application, but sponsor did meet compliance obligations for self-inspections program obligations within 30 days of submitting application.* +5
- c. *Sponsor failed to comply with self-inspections program obligations within 30 days after submitting applications.* **INELIGIBLE**

Prospective sponsors of new projects that are currently in compliance w/ the 5-year self-inspection program for previously funded L&WCF projects will be given preference. Sponsors willing to meet their obligations within 30 days of the application deadline will be given partial credit on the scoring. Sponsors who fail to comply within the 30-day grace period will be declared ineligible for a grant award during the current grant cycle. No further action will be taken on the sponsor's current or future applications until the post completion inspections are completed.

4. Implementation Period of Proposed Project
(Choose one)

-5 to +10

- a. *1-12 months* +10
- b. *13-24 months* +5
- c. *25-36 months* +0
- d. *More than 36 months* -5

Because it is the intent of the L&WCF program to use available L&WCF grant funds in a timely manner to develop new or to improve existing public outdoor recreation opportunities, time required for a sponsor to complete the implementation of proposed projects shall be a factor in the selection process. Projects that can be completed within 1 to 12 months of approval will be rated highest. Those that will require more than 36 months will be rated lowest.

- 5. Current Grant Cycle** **0 to +15**
(Only applies when the total funds requested by all sponsors exceeds funds available. Choose one as applicable):
 (1) *If project represents sponsor's highest or only priority for current grant cycle.*
 +15
 (2) *If project represents sponsor's 2nd or lower priority for current grant cycle.*
 0

Since funds requested in a grant cycle usually exceed available funds, a sponsor who submits only one application will receive the bonus points permitted by this criterion. Sponsors may submit more than one application per grant cycle. If a sponsor submits more than one application, the sponsor shall receive the bonus points only for the highest priority application. Bonus points will not be awarded to a sponsor's second or lower priority applications. The sponsor shall be responsible to identify their highest priority project application. The sponsor should be aware that the project they identify as the priority project may not receive the highest score awarded by the NDSP L&WCF Project Coordinator. The sponsor may elect to permit the NDSP L&WCF Project Coordinator to select the highest priority project for the project sponsor based solely on the scores awarded. The sponsor's decision on the method of selection must be evident in the written applications submitted to the NDSP L&WCF Project Coordinator.

- 6. Organization & Completeness of Application** **-5 to +5**

Applications will be evaluated for their organization and completeness in accordance with the application package instructions. Applications organized and completed in accordance with the instructions will receive a higher score for this criterion than applications less organized or complete. Applications so grossly incomplete that processing is not possible will be declared ineligible and returned to the sponsor without further action.

- E. PROJECT RELATIONSHIP WITH 2003 SCORP ISSUES** **(+1 to +100)**
The 8 issues below were developed as part of "Nevada's 2003 Outdoor Recreation Plan" (SCORP). These issues will be used for each L&WCF grant cycle until the SCORP is updated. Determine which of the 8 major recreational issues is being addressed by the project. (May choose more than one issue, as appropriate; scoring based on written justification and project narrative).

Possible scores attributed to each of the eight outdoor recreation issues was calculated based on the average weighted scores, in percentages, awarded to each issue by the participants in the issues and actions identification and prioritization process. A total of 100 points, approximately one-third of the maximum score possible, was established for the eight criteria. The maximum points possible for each criterion is simply the weighted score for that issue divided by the total weighted score. For example: Issue # 1—24% of the total weighted score for the eight issues was awarded by the participants in the issues process to issue # 1.

SCORP: It is important that the proposed project address at least one or more of the 8 major outdoor recreation issues identified in the 2003 SCORP. The issues are ranked in priority order. Projects addressing the more critical issues will be awarded higher point values.

1. ***Public Access to Public Lands for Diverse Outdoor Recreation:*** **0 to +24**
There is a growing need to protect, maintain, and increase public access to public lands for the greatest diversity of outdoor recreational users.
(Choose one):
 - a. *Project will provide access to public lands in an area where access is currently not available or will protect current access that is imminently threatened with closure.* *+16 to +24*
 - b. *Project will help maintain or improve existing access to public lands.* *+1 to +15*
 - c. *Project will not enhance access to public lands in any way.* *0*

Public lands are defined as lands publicly administered, most often by a federal, state, or local agency, that are open for outdoor recreation purposes to the public either free or for a reasonable fee. Lands owned and operated by the U. S. Department of Defense are for the most part not open to the public.

Projects that will provide access to public lands where public access is either not available or is imminently threatened will be rated highest under this criterion. Projects, which help maintain or enhance access to public lands where access is already available, will be rated lower than the above, but higher than projects that do not contribute to public access.

2. ***Funding Parks and Recreation:*** **0 to +21**
Existing levels of outdoor recreation funding are inadequate to meet the recreation needs of Nevada.
(Assess funds leveraged by grant, not including state administrative charge, as applicable):
Local Match (Choose one)
 - a. *> 70%* *+21*
 - b. *66% to 70%* *+16*
 - c. *61% to 65%* *+12*
 - d. *57% to 60%* *+8*
 - e. *51% to 55%* *+4*
 - f. *< 51%* *0*

The intent of the L&WCF Act is to provide “seed money” to states and local entities to acquire and develop public outdoor recreation parks and areas. States and local entities receiving L&WCF moneys are expected to make financial commitments acquire, develop, and maintain the projects for which they are requesting federal funding. Once the park or recreation area is acquired and/or developed, grantees are

responsible to maintain the project area for public outdoor recreation activities. This criterion is one measurement of the local commitment to support the project in question.

The higher the match, the higher the project score will be awarded based on this criterion. Projects must provide 50% of the project cost to be eligible for L&WCF grants. Projects exceeding the minimum 50% match in cash, volunteer or in-kind labor, donated materials, etc. will be given a rating relative to the local match percentage. This criterion is also related to each of the other seven outdoor recreation issues, and particularly to issue # 8, coordination and cooperation. This criterion is a measure of the financial commitment of the sponsor and others who may support the project.

- 3. Recreational Trails and Pathways:** **0 to +15**
There is a growing need to provide recreational trails and pathways throughout the state, in both urban and rural areas.
(Score all of the following that apply, up to a maximum score of +15). Project will provide trails, pathways, or related facilities, for the following trail activities:
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>a. Walking or jogging</i> | <i>+4</i> |
| <i>b. Bicycling</i> | <i>+2</i> |
| <i>c. OHVs, ATVs, Off-road dirt biking</i> | <i>+2</i> |
| <i>d. Hiking or backpacking</i> | <i>+2</i> |
| <i>e. Horseback riding</i> | <i>+1</i> |
| <i>f. Mountain biking</i> | <i>+1</i> |
| <i>g. Cross country skiing, Snowshoeing</i> | <i>+1</i> |
| <i>h. Canoeing/Kayaking/Rafting</i> | <i>+1</i> |

The trails activities are listed in the order of total participation cited in participation tables found in chapter 3 of Nevada's 2003 SCORP. For simplicity, trail activities which may occur on the same trail were combined in some instances. For example, walking includes walking with or without a dog. Walking is combined with jogging since they both may occur on the same trail without trail user conflicts. Multiple activities may occur on the same trail if the trail is designed to accommodate a variety of uses. For example, bicycling may occur on trails with walking and jogging if the trail is wide enough to reduce user conflicts. The relative weights given to each activity is based on the annual participation cited in chapter 3 of Nevada's 2003 SCORP. The above list of trail activities are the most significant and obvious outdoor recreation activities that occur on a trail if trail opportunities are available. Many other activities, such as wildlife viewing, may also occur on trails.

Projects that provide the greatest variety of trail uses will score highest under this criterion. Even though each project may receive a maximum of 15 points for this criterion, it is highly unlikely that a project would provide for all of the trail activities listed.

4. *Balancing the Protection of Nevada's Natural, Cultural, and Scenic Resources with Users:* **0 to +12**

Protection of natural resources needs to be put in balance with users. Create opportunities for the users to participate in the protection, i.e., as site stewards—mandate that a majority of fees paid in a recreation area stay in that area for improvements and maintenance. Citizens acknowledge this as an investment and a way to participate in the conservation of these resources.

(Pick one of the following that best applies to the project):

- a. *Project will significantly enhance the protection of important natural, cultural, or scenic resources and/or includes a component that will encourage users to actively participate in their protection.* **+7 to +12**
- b. *Project will somewhat protect natural, cultural, or scenic resources and/or includes a component that will encourage users to somehow participate in their protection.* **+1 to +6**
- c. *Project will do little or nothing to protect natural, cultural, or scenic resources and contains no component to encourage user participation in their protection.* **0**

Projects will be assessed points under this criterion relative to the degree of protection provided for important natural, cultural, or scenic resources OR the degree to which the project affords public participation in resource protection. The intent is to permit outdoor recreation activities in areas with natural, cultural, or scenic resources without destroying the amenity which attracted the recreationists to the area. Recreationists are the key to the protection of these valuable outdoor recreation resources. Unless the recreationists are conservation minded, the conservation of these resources will be in danger of destruction. Recreationists have to be willing to pay reasonable fees to utilize these resources. Legislation and management policies which permit the fees to be used to support the conservation and maintenance of these resources is just one of means available to enhance the efforts to preserve these valuable treasures.

5. Protecting Water Resources as Vital Components of Nevada's Recreation Base: 0 to +9
Water resources must be protected to maintain the needed quantity, quality, and accessibility for public recreation. Recreation and wildlife depend on the limited water resources in Nevada.

(Check all that apply in a, b, and c. One point per check; maximum points as shown.)

a. Project provides water-based recreation. (Max 5 points)

- ☐ Swimming in lake or stream
- ☐ Motorboating
- ☐ Lake fishing
- ☐ Water-skiing
- ☐ Stream fishing
- ☐ Canoeing/kayaking/rafting
- ☐ Sailing

b. Project provides recreational opportunities adjacent to water. (Max 3 points)

- ☐ Wildlife viewing
- ☐ Picnicking
- ☐ Tent camping
- ☐ Vehicle camping
- ☐ Bird hunting
- ☐ Other _____

c. ☐ Creates or enhances prime wildlife habitat. (Max 1 point)

Projects that provide water-based recreation such as swimming, boating, waterskiing, etc. will be rated highest under this criterion. Projects which provide recreation enhanced by its proximity to a water body or stream such as wildlife viewing, or waterfront picnicking, camping, or bird hunting will be rated slightly lower than the water-based recreation opportunities, but higher than projects which do not create or enhance water-oriented activities. Since wildlife habitat may support outdoor recreational activities, projects that create or enhance prime wildlife habitat will receive one point.

6. Interpretation and Education of Outdoor Recreation Opportunities: 0 to +7
Encourage, fund, and provide environmental, cultural, and heritage interpretation and educational programs and opportunities, especially outdoor opportunities, throughout Nevada.

a. Degree to which the project provides for environmental or cultural heritage interpretation and/or education programs or opportunities. 0 to +7

(Circle one number)

Not Significant						Very Significant
0	2	3	4	5	6	7

Projects that provide significant environmental, cultural, or heritage interpretation and/or education programs and opportunities for outdoor recreation opportunities will be rated higher than those that afford only modest programs or opportunities. Those projects that provide no such programs or opportunities will be rated lowest.

7. Nevada's Growing Population Places Increasing Demand on Outdoor Recreation Resources and Suppliers: **0 to +6**

Nevada's growing population is placing an increasing demand on recreation resources and recreation suppliers at all levels, statewide. New resources need to be identified, acquired, funded, and developed.

(Pick one of the following that best applies to the proposed project):

- a. Project will make significant new recreation resources(s) available to the recreating public. +6
- b. Project will make minor new recreation resource(s) available or enhance existing recreation resources for the recreating public. +4
- c. Project will moderately enhance a significant existing recreation resource. +3
- d. Project will only provide modest enhancement of a lesser existing recreation resource. +1

Projects that create significant new recreation resources will be rated higher than those which create lesser recreation resources. Projects that will merely enhance existing resources will be rated lower, depending on their degree of significance.

8. Coordination and Cooperation Between Recreation Providers: **0 to +6**

Coordination and cooperation between public and private recreation providers at all levels is very important. More true support from private citizens, user groups, and governmental entities (local, state, and federal), are important partnerships to pursue:

- a. Project sponsor will be receiving cooperation and support for the project from other public or private entities in terms of donations of cash materials, donated equipment, volunteer labor, etc. Value of donation as percentage of project cost (Check one)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 50% or more | +6 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 40-49% | +5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 30-39% | +4 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20-29% | +3 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10-19% | +2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-9% | +1 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1% | +0 |

Projects which can demonstrate strong local or regional coordination and cooperation from various public or private agencies and organizations in terms of volunteerism, donations, etc., will be ranked higher than those which exhibit little or no public coordination and cooperation. Of interest to this criterion is support that contributes directly to the completion of the project as proposed in the application. Letters of support, although of some importance, without the author making any other commitment to the project will not be awarded any points.

Appendix A
Nevada Land & Water Conservation Fund
Rating System Worksheet

NEVADA LAND & WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Rating System Worksheet

Project: _____ **Score:** _____

Sponsor/Applicant: _____ **Rank:** _____

Reviewed By: _____ **Date:** _____

☐ **Acquisition Project** ☐ **Development Project** ☐ **Combined Project**

Federal Share: _____ **Local Share:** _____ **Total:** _____

The application should be complete and include the following items:

- ☐ Standard Form 424
- ☐ Program Narrative
- ☐ Environmental Documentation
- ☐ Dated project boundary map and location map
- ☐ Resolution from applicant's governing body
- ☐ EEO Contract Compliance Form
- ☐ Civil Rights Assurance
- ☐ SCORP Reference(s) clearly identified
- ☐ Section 106 NHPA documentation for SHPO evaluation

If an acquisition project, must also have:

- ☐ Acquisition schedule
- ☐ Preliminary title report
- ☐ Appraisal per Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions
- ☐ Parcel maps

If a development project, must also have:

- ☐ Cost estimate
- ☐ Development plan/site plan

Is the application complete? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

(Points may be deducted if not complete; application may be returned.)

Comments: _____

Appendix B
Nevada Land & Water Conservation Fund
Grant Rating Criteria

NEVADA LAND & WATER CONSERVATION FUND GRANT RATING CRITERIA

CRITERIA	POSSIBLE RATING	SCORE
A. GENERAL PLANNING CRITERIA (-9 to +40)		
1. Project Use and Design (Score each of the following):	0 to +15	
a. Degree to which the proposed project design enhances the existing surroundings (high, medium or low).	0 to +5	
b. Degree to which proposed project provides accessibility for persons with disabilities (high, medium or low).	0 to +5	
c. Degree to which project will provide features attractive to populations w/ special recreation requirements (i.e. senior citizens, youth, disabled persons, minorities, etc).	0 to +5	
2. Environmental Considerations: Degree to which the proposed project will impact the environment negatively, mitigates environmental impacts or enhances the environment.	-5 to +5	
3. Competitive Impact: Degree to which the proposed project will compete with private facilities.	-5 to 0	
4. Ability to Satisfy Basic Outdoor Recreation Needs (Requires written documentation of needs. Choose one):	+1 to +10	
a. Project will provide needed facilities where none now exist.	+7 to +10	
b. Project will provide needed facilities where the particular type of facility proposed does not exist.	+4 to +6	
c. Project will augment existing facilities where they are insufficient to meet existing needs.	+1 to +3	
5. Local Land Use, Zoning, and Planning: Degree to which the proposed project is consistent with local land uses, land use plans and zoning.	0 to +5	
6. Public Participation in Project Planning: Degree to which the project proposal has involved members of the public in the planning process.	0 to +5	
B. CRITERIA FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT (+2 to +35)		
1. Demand for Facility – based on evidence supplied with pre-award discussions, project proposal, public preference or participation surveys, demand/supply analyses, current use figures at similar facilities, other locally generated statistics, planning documentation, or other documented justification (Choose one):	0 to +10	
a. High	+8 to +10	
b. Medium	+4 to +7	
c. Low	0 to +3	

CRITERIA	POSSIBLE RATING	SCORE
2. Multiple-Use Considerations Project will provide multiple-use opportunities involving (Choose one):	+1 to +5	
a. More than four recreational activities.	+5	
b. At least four recreational activities.	+4	
c. At least three recreational activities.	+3	
d. At least two recreational activities.	+2	
e. Only a single use recreational activity.	+1	
3. Land Ownership (Choose one):	0 to +10	
a. Fee Simple or permanent easement	+10	
b. Lease of more than 60 years	+7	
c. Lease of 31 - 60 years	+5	
d. Lease of 26 - 30 years	+3	
e. Lease of 25 years	0	
f. Lease less than 25 years	INELIGIBLE	
4. Seasonal Use (Choose one):	+1 to +5	
a. 4 seasons	+5	
b. 3 seasons	+4	
c. 2 seasons	+3	
d. 1 season	+1	
5. Creativity and Originality: Degree to which project demonstrates creative solutions and/or design originality (i.e., alternate energy provisions, low-maintenance features, multiple-use provisions, etc.), and shows potential for applications to other projects.	0 to +5	
C. CRITERIA FOR PROJECT AREA (+3 to +65)		
1. Proximity to Population Centers (Score a, and b or c below):	0 to +20	
a. Will project protect or enhance scarce natural or cultural resources near population centers (communities > 1,000 pop) and/or heavy use areas? If Yes → If No →	+5 to +10 0	
b. Will project provide or enhance recreation opportunities in or near population centers (communities > 1,000 pop) that have (Choose one): (1) No recreational facilities (2) Severe shortage of recreational facilities (3) Moderate shortage of recreational facilities (4) Slight shortage of recreational facilities (5) Adequate recreational facilities	+10 +8 +6 +3 0	
c. Will project provide or enhance recreational opportunities in rural areas (populations < 1,000) that have (Choose one): (1) No recreational facilities (2) Severe shortage of recreational facilities (3) Moderate shortage of recreational facilities (4) Slight shortage of recreational facilities (5) Adequate recreational facilities	+5 +4 +3 +2 0	

CRITERIA	POSSIBLE RATING	SCORE
2. Service Area Served by Project:	+2 to +10	
a. Statewide	+10	
b. Regional (multi-county)	+8	
c. County-wide	+6	
d. Local community	+4	
e. Neighborhood	+2	
3. Anticipated Use of Facility (Based on number of visitors anticipated on an annual basis—choose one):	+1 to +5	
a. High 100,000 or more	+5	
b. Medium-High 75,000 to 99,999	+4	
c. Medium 50,000 to 74,999	+3	
d. Medium-Low 10,000 to 49,999	+2	
e. Low Less than 10,000	+1	
4. Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships (Check all that apply. Score 3 points per entity, up to a max of +15):	0 to +15	
<input type="checkbox"/> Federal <input type="checkbox"/> State <input type="checkbox"/> County <input type="checkbox"/> Town or City <input type="checkbox"/> School District <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement District <input type="checkbox"/> Unincorporated Community <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Profit Organization <input type="checkbox"/> Organized User Group <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify _____)	0 to +15	
5. Economically Depressed Community Status: Compare the average household income or the average unemployment rate of the project service area with the countywide or statewide economic data, whichever is appropriate. Refer to the explanation in the narrative for instructions on how to assess this criterion.	0 to +15	
D. ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA (-50 to +65)		
1. Previous L&WCF Project History	-30 to +15	
a. Has sponsor ever received a L&WCF grant? If Yes, go to b. If No, award +15 points → then go to 4.	+15	
b. Has sponsor received a L&WCF grant within the last 15 years? If yes, go to c. If No, award +10 points → then go to 2.	+10	
c. Has sponsor received a L&WCF grant within the last 5 years? If No, → go to 2. If yes, were project(s) awarded the sponsor over the last 5 years? (Choose one)		
(1) Completed prior to original deadlines	+10	
(2) Completed within 1-12 months past original deadlines	+5	
(3) Completed > 12 months past original deadlines	0	
(4) Canceled due to non performance	-5 to -1	
d. Previous 5 year record for general project administration (no history = 0)	-5 to +5	
e. Preceding Grant Cycle—project sponsor was awarded L&WCF grant(s) during immediately preceding grant cycle with a composite total amount of (Choose one):	0 to -20	
(1) \$250,000 or more	-20	
(2) \$200,000 up to \$249,999	-15	
(3) \$100,000 up to \$199,999	-10	
(4) Less than \$100,000	-5	
(5) Did not receive grant in previous cycle	0	

CRITERIA	POSSIBLE RATING	SCORE
2. Operations and Maintenance —Record of sponsor's performance during the last 5 years in operating and maintaining existing facilities is an indicator of ability and commitment to adequately operate and maintain future L&WCF program funded facilities.	-10 to +10	
3. Post Completion Inspections Compliance (Choose one):	+5 to +10	
a. Sponsor complied with obligations to provide 5-year self-inspections of previously funded L&WCF projects prior to submission of application.	+10	
b. Sponsor was not in compliance prior to submitting application, but sponsor did meet compliance obligations for self-inspections program obligations within 30 days of submitting application.	+5	
c. Sponsor failed to comply with self-inspections program obligations within 30 days after submitting application.	INELIGIBLE	
4. Implementation Period of Proposed Project (Choose one):	-5 to +10	
a. 1-12 months	+10	
b. 13-24 months	+5	
c. 25-36 months	0	
d. More than 36 months	-5	
5. Current Grant Cycle (Only applies when the total funds requested by all sponsors exceeds funds available - choose one as applicable):	0 to +15	
(1) If project represents sponsor's highest or only priority for current grant cycle	+15	
(2) If project represents sponsor's 2 nd or lower priority for current grant cycle	0	
6. Organization & Completeness of Application	-5 to +5	
E. PROJECT RELATIONSHIPS WITH 2003 SCORP ISSUES (+1 to +100)		
The 8 issues below were developed as part of "Nevada's 2003 Outdoor Recreation Plan" (SCORP). These issues will be used for each L&WCF grant cycle until the SCORP is updated. Determine which of the 8 major recreational issues is being addressed by the project. (May choose more than one issue, as appropriate; scoring based on written justification and project narrative).		
1. Public Access to Public Lands for Diverse Outdoor Recreation: There is a growing need to protect, maintain, and increase public access to public lands for the greatest diversity of outdoor recreational users (Choose one):	0 to +24	
a. Project will provide access to public lands in an area where access is currently not available or will protect current access that is imminently threatened with closure.	+16 to +24	
b. Project will help maintain or improve existing access to public lands.	+1 to +15	
c. Project will not enhance access to public lands in any way.	0	

CRITERIA	POSSIBLE RATING	SCORE
2. Funding Parks and Recreation: Existing levels of outdoor recreation funding are inadequate to meet the recreation needs of Nevada. (Assess funds leveraged by grant, not including state administrative charge, as applicable):	0 to +21	
Local Match (Choose one)		
a. >70%.	+21	
b. 66% to 70%	+16	
c. 61% to 65%	+12	
d. 57% to 60%	+8	
e. 51% to 55	+4	
f. <51%	0	
3. Recreational Trails and Pathways: There is a growing need to provide recreational trails and pathways throughout the state, in both urban and rural areas (Score all of the following that apply, up to a maximum score of +15). Project will provide trails, pathways, or related facilities, for the following trail activities:	0 to +15	
a. Walking or jogging	+4	
b. Bicycling	+2	
c. OHVs, ATVs, Off-road dirt biking	+2	
d. Hiking or backpacking	+2	
e. Horseback riding	+2	
f. Mountain biking	+1	
g. Cross country skiing, Snowshoeing	+1	
h. Canoeing/Kayaking/Rafting	+1	
4. Balancing the Protection of Nevada's Natural, Cultural, and Scenic Resources: Protection of natural resources needs to be put in balance with users. Create opportunities for the users to participate in the protection, i.e., as site stewards—mandate that a majority of fees paid in a recreation area stay in that area for improvements and maintenance. Citizens acknowledge this as an investment and a way to participate in the conservation of these resources. (Pick one of the following that best applies to the project):	0 to +12	
a. Project will significantly enhance the protection of important natural, cultural or scenic resources and/or includes a component that will encourage users to actively participate in their protection.	+7 to +12	
b. Project will somewhat protect natural, cultural or scenic resources and/or includes a component that will encourage users to somehow participate in their protection.	+1 to +6	
c. Project will do little or nothing to protect natural, cultural or scenic resources and contains no component to encourage user participation in their protection.	0	

CRITERIA	POSSIBLE RATING	SCORE
7. Nevada's Growing Population Places Increasing Demand on Outdoor Recreation Resources and Suppliers: Nevada's growing population is placing an increasing demand on recreation resources and recreation suppliers at all levels, statewide. New resources need to be identified, acquired, funded, and developed. (Pick one of the following that best applies to the proposed project):	0 to +6	
a. Project will make <u>significant new</u> recreation resource(s) available to the recreating public.	+6	
b. Project will make <u>minor new</u> recreation resource(s) available or enhance existing recreation resources for the recreating public.	+4	
c. Project will enhance a <u>significant existing</u> recreation resource.	+3	
d. Project will only provide modest enhancement of a <u>lesser existing</u> recreation resource.	+1	
8. Coordination and Cooperation Between Recreation Providers: Coordination and cooperation between public and private recreation providers at all levels is very important. More true support from private citizens, user groups, and governmental entities (local, state, and federal), are important partnerships to pursue:	0 to +6	
a. Project sponsor will be receiving cooperation and support for the project from other public or private entities in terms of donations of cash or materials, donated equipment, volunteer labor, etc. Value of donation as percentage of project cost (Check one) <input type="checkbox"/> 50% or more +6 <input type="checkbox"/> 40-49% +5 <input type="checkbox"/> 30-39% +4 <input type="checkbox"/> 20-29% +3 <input type="checkbox"/> 10-19% +2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-9% +1 <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1% 0	0 to +6	
TOTAL POSSIBLE/AWARDED POINTS	305	

Appendix C
Public Comments on the
Draft 2003 Open Project Selection Process

Public Comments on the Draft 2003 OPSP

Nevada Division of State Parks Drafting of the 2003 OPSP

The previous OPSP went through extensive revisions in February-March 2003, before submission as the Draft 2003 OPSP to the public for review and comment. Steve Weaver, Chief of Planning and Development, Nevada Division of State Parks, made the first and most extensive revisions. Steve submitted the revised draft to Jim DeLoney, Park and Recreation Manager, Nevada Division of State Parks, for review and comment. After DeLoney completed his review, Weaver and DeLoney meet in conference for further discussion and revisions to the Draft 2003 OPSP.

Five OPSP Public Meetings

Upon completion of the revisions conducted by Weaver and DeLoney, 192 political entities, individuals, and organizations throughout Nevada (shown in Appendix D) were invited to attend one of the five public meetings to be held across Nevada. The five public meetings were held as follows:

- March 21, 2003, in Las Vegas
- March 27, 2003, in Reno
- April 4, 2003, in Carson City
- April 7, 2003, in Ely
- April 8, 2003, in Elko

Persons receiving the public announcement about the public meetings were encouraged to invite others. The announcement was posted in the following locations across the state according to Nevada's Open Meeting Law. The first five locations are the sites of the public meetings. Hosts to the public meetings are as shown.

1. Clark County Government Center
500 South Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
Host: Chris Knight, Las Vegas Planning and Development
2. McKinley Arts & Culture Center
925 Riverside Drive
Reno, Nevada 89503
Host: Ed Schenk, Reno Parks, Recreation and Community Services
3. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
123 West Nye Lane
Carson City, Nevada 89706
Host: Vern Krahn, Carson City Parks & Recreation Department
4. White Pine County Library
950 Campton Street
Ely, Nevada 89301
Host: Karen Rajala, White Pine Economic Diversification Council

5. Elko Convention & Visitors Authority
700 Moren Way
Elko, Nevada 89501
Host: Ralph McMullen, Elko Convention & Visitors Authority
6. Nevada Division of State Parks Headquarters
1300 South Curry Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703-5202
7. Western Nevada Carson/Tahoe Region, Nevada Division of State Parks
1060 Mallory Way
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5301
8. Central Nevada—Fallon Region, Nevada Division of State Parks
16799 Lahontan Dam
Fallon, Nevada 89406
9. Eastern Nevada—Panaca Region, Nevada Division of State Parks
P.O. Box 176
Panaca, Nevada 89042
10. Southern Nevada—Las Vegas Region, Nevada Division of State Parks
4747 Vegas Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89108
11. Nevada State Parks website at <http://parks.nv.gov>

Copies of the materials sent to invite persons to the five OPSP meetings are shown at appendix F. A sample of the letter sent to the meeting hosts to confirm the specifics of each of the five meetings is also shown in appendix F.

The Draft 2003 OPSP was revised after each of the first three public meetings for use in the second, third, fourth, and fifth public meetings. Final revisions were made to the Draft 2003 OPSP after the fifth public meeting. Comments received during each of the five meetings were the basis for the revisions. Revisions made to the Draft 2003 OPSP from the public comments were extensive.

Comments received from respondents are cited below. Comments in quotes are exact quotes. Comments not in quotes are paraphrased. The Draft 2003 OPSP was revised after each of the first, second, and third OPSP meetings to reflect the public input received in each of the first three public meetings. Time did not permit the revision of draft after the fourth OPSP meeting before the fifth OPSP meeting.

Not reflected in the comments are the discussions that ensued in each of the five public meetings conducted to receive comments and suggestions on how to improve the 2003 OPSP to make it more responsive to the processing and scoring local project applications. Each public workshop was conducted in an informal, interactive format to permit active discussions. Participants also received a brief update on the status of Nevada's 2003 Outdoor Recreation Plan and how the OPSP serves as a tool to implement the SCORP.

At the beginning of each of the five public meetings, DeLoney gave an update on the status of the development of the 2003 SCORP. DeLoney explained how the OPSP tied to the 2003 SCORP. Weaver followed DeLoney with an explanation of SB 144. Weaver then gave a detailed presentation and explanation of the OPSP process and scoring criteria. Participants were encouraged to offer comments and suggestions throughout each of the five presentations. This approach proved very effective in soliciting input from the participants in the meetings. In essence, the public workshops functioned like focus groups conducted for marketing purposes to review a product, in this case the Draft 2003 OPSP.

Comments From the Five Public Meetings

Comments received during the five public meetings are listed below. Comments are grouped by each of the five public meetings.

Las Vegas Meeting March 21, 2003 9:00 a.m.-12:00 noon

“Can a non-profit apply?”

Answer: If a non-profit wants to apply they would have to submit the application through a political entity.

The proposed administrative fee may hurt locals, particularly rural areas.

It is harder for small communities to make the required 50% match.

If SB 144 passes, lower the \$50,000 minimum to \$5,000.

Are points awarded for water quality?

Move “Access to Water-Oriented Recreation” to last criteria section titled “Project Relationship with 2003 SCORP Issues.” Done.

Was “urban” defined? Answer: Yes, they are called population centers.

On a multi-phased project, which phase is considered when scoring the project?

Answer: Project is scored only for the phase to which the project applies. May look at the other phases, but they would not influence the score.

How practical are the “Implementation Period of Proposed Project” six month completion time frames? Answer: Changed each to twelve months.

Move “Local Match” criteria to Issue # 2—Funding under the “Project Relationships with 2003 SCORP Issues.” Done.

Reno Meeting
March 27, 2003
9:00 a.m.- 12:00 noon

“Jim/Steve—Thanks for all of the great info on the L&WCF Program. Terry (Zeller) and I picked up a lot of great hints and suggestions. It was great to help work thru the process.”

“Administrative Criteria, 1.c. Preceding Grant Cycle” Insert in narrative. Done.

2003 SCORP Issues, Issue # 2—graduate the percent match increments to coincide with weighting scheme. Done.

Will the surcharge be assessed annually?
Answer: Steve. No.

What will the 7% surcharge be a percentage of?
Answer: Steve. The federal share only. Locals will only pay half of the 7% surcharge, or 3.5%. NDSP will pay the other half, or 3.5%.

Is the idea to obligate all of the L&WCF moneys before the end of FY 2003?
Answer: Steve. Yes.

Projects less than \$50,000 not be worth processing.

The 7% surcharge may be difficult for locals during tight budget times.

The timing of the 7% surcharge payment to the NDSP will be a concern to locals.

I can't go to my Board (Washoe County) until notification of the grant award. Then it will take another 60 days to get the Board's approval, then another 30 days to process the check to the NDSP, so you're looking at a total of 90 days.

Q-Does the Board (Washoe County) require a “Resolution?”
Answer: Yes, for L&WCF grants. Board actually acknowledges acceptance of the grant.

Steve: A special budget category will be set up in the NDSP Accounting to receive the surcharge.

Where does the other 50% of the Nevada's L&WCF allocation go?
Answer: Steve. To the NDSP for state park projects. We will use the L&WCF moneys to match the Question 1 Open Space Bond (passed November 2002) moneys.

The NABNR questioned one person doing the scoring for local grant applications. Will they accept one person doing the scoring, i.e., not having a “Committee” to do the scoring?

Answer: Steve. Yes.

Environmental considerations: Applicant may see the project as positive to the environment, but the NDSP may see the project as negative to the environment.

Steve: Explain the impact that the project will have on the environment in the narrative.

Should an applicant use the population growth found in the national standards.

Answer: Steve: Yes.

Is the “Demand for Facility” in #1 under “Criteria for the Proposed Project” the same as 4.a, “Project will provide needed facilities where none now exist?”

Answer: Steve: Yes, there is some overlap. The scoring is different, however.

Comment: I’m thinking how I’d present the material twice.

Steve: “Demand for facility” is more objective than the “Ability to Satisfy Basic Outdoor Recreation Needs.”

The cost of some single purpose projects is high (Multiple-Use Considerations).

Steve: Yes, but you only get +5 points max.

Land Ownership: Discussion ensued about the R&PP leases—do they meet the requirement for leases?

Steve: Said he’d check with the NPS.

Rose said R&PP’s are not eligible.

Check on railroad ROW’s. City pays a yearly fee for these.

Steve: This would be a problem

Rose: Some easements have an annual fee.

How do you define “near an urban area or population center?”

Steve: Explain your case in the narrative. The definition is not specific. It varies.

Service Area Served by Project: “Statewide” gives 8 points more than “neighborhood.”

Steve: Most projects fit into county-wide, local community, or neighborhood service areas. Very few fit into regional or statewide service areas.

Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships: Can an applicant count partnerships with the NDSP or NPS?

Steve: No.

Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships: If the project involves multiple towns or cities, do you score 3 points for each one.

Steve: Yes, but explain your approach in the narrative.

Steve: Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships overlaps with the issue criteria “Coordination and Cooperation.” Steve thinks that Coordination and Cooperation should get more than +3 points.

Response to comments: The Coordination and Cooperation criterion was revised. Up to +6 points can now be awarded for this criterion now. The Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships criteria permits 3 points for each partner in the project, up to a maximum of +15 points.

Economically Depressed Community Status: Is it +15 or nothing?

Steve: Yes.

A project may serve an economically depressed community but the project may be located in the depressed there.

The objective seems to be to get funds into the depressed areas.

I suggest a sliding scale.

Steve: Suggested revising the criterion to permit awarding points based on a percentage of the service area. For example, if 30% of the project service area is comprised of an EDC (Economically Depressed Community), award 30% of the 15 possible points, or 4.5 points.

Response: The narrative amplifying this criterion was revised to explain how to award points on a percentage of the total points possible.

How far does the “Previous L&WCF History” go back?

Steve: Five years. Put this in the narrative.

Response. Done.

The record of past performance on operations and maintenance is difficult to verify.

Response. Agreed.

Jim suggested to the participants to weight the criteria based on the 2003 SCORP issues by the weighted scores provided by the 132 participants in the public issues identification and prioritization process. The total weight for the 8 outdoor recreation issues criteria would be 100 points, or roughly 1/3 of the maximum possible score per project. The 100 points would be distributed among the 8 issues criteria based on the percentage of the weighted scores for each issue. The participants all agreed with this suggestion. Jim revised the “possible scoring” accordingly.

Do trails in local parks provide access?

Answer: A short trail totally contained in a park may not improve access to public lands, provided the public park already existed and the public had access to the park. A trail properly designed may, however, improve access to certain features in the park. Many local parks in Nevada do serve as access points to federal lands in particular. These situations would certainly meet both the criteria found in issue #1 and #3, and maybe more issues. To receive points, the applicant should carefully explain in the narrative how the project will address each issue.

Carson City Meeting

April 4, 2003

9:00 a.m.-12:00 noon

Is the State L&WCF Manual on the NDSP website?

Steve: No. Steve encourage people to go ahead and start on their applications, and not to wait on the revise Manual. This way they could get most of their application done. After the State L&WCF Manual is completed, they can easily revise their application without much effort.

Explain how the surcharge and direct costs would work.

Steve: Explained both approaches. Only one state, Utah, uses the direct cost method. Arizona charges a surcharge. The purpose of the surcharge is to pay the salary for one L&WCF grants staff person and the operational costs for that person to function. The surcharge is a percentage charge assessed to each applicant. Once the Intent to Award is made, the sponsor would send the NDSP a check. In effect, the surcharge reduces the federal share to approximately 48% (rather than 50%). After the NDSP receives the check for the surcharge, NDSP issues a Notice to Proceed.

What do the political subdivisions pay?

Steve: Political subs pay ½ of the 7% surcharge; the NDSP pays the other half on the Nevada State Parks projects.

Was there any public input in the state park projects?

Steve: Yes, during the development of each state park master plan.

Can the state use in-kind to match?

Steve: We could, but there is no need to.

Dollars available for the match for state park projects is finite. The state needs more L&WCF to match the \$27 million from the Open Space Bond Initiative.

Steve: Concurred.

When will the NPS decide on the administrative charges Steve is proposing?

Steve: NPS wants all of the L&WCF moneys to be allocated before the end of the federal fiscal year. The problem is that the federal budget was not released to the states until about five months into the fiscal year. Nevada needs the NPS to approve a method for us to charge the administrative fee that we can live with. The actual percentage that will be charged for the administrative fee will vary each fiscal year. First, we have to get the federal allocation to Nevada and then determine the percent administrative fee based on the allocation.

What will the NDSP do with the 7% surcharge if they don't hire a grants person in December 2003:

Steve: May do a partial, not full, refund. We will have already incurred some costs to conduct the process to that point.

Steve explained the NABNR's role in the process. Steve pointed out that the SLO has the final say on the recommendations sent to the NPS. The SLO can overrule the

NABNR, but he never has. The NPS usually goes along with the state's recommendations. An applicant may appear before the NABNR.

Will the funds be available to the sponsors in the fall of this year?

Steve: NABNR will be the critical part of the process. The NABNR only meets every so often. Hopefully, the process will be done in August.

When is the property appraisal done?

Steve: The sponsor will have to do an "estimate" before the project is submitted to the NDSP. Cost of the appraisal is an eligible expense. The estimate needs to be close the actual appraisal.

Steve: The maximum federal side of the grant is \$250,000; minimum has been \$50,000. This is a policy decision to spread the money around. We will look at a \$25,000 minimum this year for larger entities and less than \$25,000 for smaller entities.

What are the environmental requirements?

Steve: Some projects qualify for categorical exclusions. NPS can require an environmental assessment.

Does and EA have to be done before the project application is submitted?

Steve: The applicant has to go through the check list provided in the application packet. The NPS has to do the EA. Applicant provides the data and the information for the EA. It is getting more difficult to get categorical exclusions approved.

Does the EA count as match?

Steve: I don't see a problem, but I will have to check to be sure. The NPS gives a "conditional approval" on the EA.

Steve went over the OPSP Criteria. He emphasized that the narrative in the application should explain how the project meets the criteria.

How were the points awarded to each criteria determined?

Steve: Subjectively.

How do you decide the cutoff for funding?

Steve: We go from the project that scores the highest down the list to the funds run out.

Is public input required for an application?

Steve: No, not if public input has already been done, say in the master plan development process.

Do you have an example of a good application in the packet?

Steve: No, but we can incorporate one into the revised manual.

Vern Krahn noted that the RecTrails Grants Manual does have a completed application in an appendix.

How is “urban area” defined? (Proximity to Population Centers criterion).

Steve: Changed the term “urban area” to read “population centers.”

Simplify the application.

How much documentation does the NDSP want?

Steve: What we want are specifics to the project, not volume. We want facts, not generalities. It is more difficult to document a project which proposes a new facility.

Will we get 3 points for each federal agency involved in the project? (Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships criteria).

Steve: Yes. Specify each one under “Other.” Suggested changing “User Group” to read “Organized User Group.” Participants agreed. Change was made.

Where can we find the “Economically Depressed Community Status” data?

Steve: On the internet.

Can you cite the internet source in the application or manual for the applicants to use?

Steve: Yes.

Combine D.1.(3) &(4) to read “Previous projects completed 1-12 months past deadline.”

Steve: Concurred. Done.

Increase points for D.2 Operations and Maintenance.

Steve: Changed from “-5 to +5” to “-10 to +10.” Done.

E.1. Public Access to Public Lands—Is this federal lands only?

Steve: No. It can be any public lands.

E.2. Funding—The point spread enhances the idea of match to encourage match and cooperation on projects.

E.2. Funding—A larger point spread would separate projects from each other better.

Steve: Concurred and revised point spread accordingly.

E.4. Protection of Nevada’s...--The larger point spread here does separates projects.

Does this criterion include open spaces.

Jim: Yes.

E.5.b.—Add an “Other” category so applicants can list additional activities.

Done.

Ely Meeting
April 7, 2003
2:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

Which Legislative Committee is SB 144 in?

Steve: The Governmental Affairs Committee. Nevada Association of Counties and the League of Cities have reviewed SB 144 and changes were made to address their concerns. The bill now specifies exactly whom they can hire and the operational costs.

Steve: The advantage of the direct cost method is that the feds pick up $\frac{1}{2}$, the state picks up $\frac{1}{4}$, and the political subs $\frac{1}{4}$ of the 7% surcharge.

The Assembly and Natural Resources Committee will be touring Ely on April 26, 2003. I will put in a good word for SB 144.

A.1.c.—Project Use and Design—add “youth” after “senior citizens.”
Done.

C.5—Economically Depressed Community Status. I have fought this issue ever since the BMP Mining closed. HUD still hasn’t released 2000 data. Employment in Ely is now 45% public employees. We lost 40% of our assessed property valuation. White Pine County hasn’t levied property taxes recently—laws prevent us from doing so. Rural communities don’t have swimming pools, tennis courts, etc. Rural communities do have fishing, hunting, etc., access. Problem is that the people don’t get balanced recreational activities to prepare for later in life.

C.5—Economically Depressed Community Status. Revise to reflect “other pertinent data” and “Nevada State Demographer” as a source of data/information. Done.

D.1.a.—The engineers changed our project. This caused us to have to change our “original deadline.” Change “deadline” to read “original deadline.”
Steve: Concurred. Done.

D.2—Operations and Maintenance. Change “Record of past performance” to read “Record of past performance in past 5 years.”
Steve: Concurred. Done.

E.3. Recreational Trails—We have really had active groups working on trails in White Pine County. We need to get them to apply for grants.

E.4.—Amplify the explanation of this issue in the narrative. Done.

E.4—Change the points to permit a point spread for each criterion under this issue.
Steve: Concurred. Changed the points as follows: “+12” to “+7 to +12”; “+6” to “+1 to +6”. Also delete the word “important” in b and c. Done

E.5—Water Resources...--Would a trail at Cummins Lake be “access?”

Jim: Yes.

E.6. Interpretation and Education—Can a historical facility that needs restoration and interpretation qualify. Answer: No. Interpretation can qualify under the RecTrails grants (must be a component of a trail or trail facility). Historic facilities are not eligible for L&WCF grants.

The first Saturday in September is National Public Lands Day. This is when we get a lot of people out to work. This is a time when we can get a lot of work done on RecTrails or L&WCF type projects. It would help if the grants are processed before then so we can utilize this resource to get work done on the projects.

Elko Meeting

April 8, 2003

10:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

How were the State Park projects ranked for the \$27 million bond issue ranked?

Steve: Based on the public input received during the development of the master plans.

A.1. Project Use and Design—Is an amphitheater eligible for a L&WCF grant?

Steve: I think so.

A.1. Project Use and Design—Are feasibility studies eligible for L&WCF grants?

Steve: No.

What things are eligible:

Steve: Engineer drawings done for the application. If the project is approved, you can get reimbursed. I think it's up to two years before you submit the project. I need to check this, however.

A.1.c—How much narrative is needed for each criterion?

Steve: One paragraph/criterion is the guideline.

Jim: Be specific. Don't write in general terms.

What do R&PP's apply to?

Steve: R&PP's only apply to BLM properties, not to other federal agencies.

A.3. Competitive Impact—Can HARP (Humboldt Area River Project) compliment private enterprises, such as campgrounds?

Answer: Yes.

B.2. Multiple-Use Considerations—What do you consider a multi-use opportunity?

Steve: Multi-use ball fields.

How about a trail with a par course?

Steve: Yes, we would count this as multi-use.

B.3. Land Ownership—Do you have the land before you submit the project application?
Steve: Yes. We then explained the variances. For example, a L&WCF project may be an acquisition project; land donations may be counted as match if the timing is according to the NPS guidelines, etc. If there are any questions on the land ownership, it's best to check with the NDSP. If needed, we'll check with the NPS. We have to get the land ownership correct.

D.1.c. Preceding Grant Cycle—How do multi-year phased projects work?

Steve: You will not lose points on this criterion only if the phases occur every other year, assuming you did get L&WCF grants for each phase. This criterion only applies to the L&WCF grants awarded to fund the project.

E.1. Public Access to Public Lands—Would public lands include city owned lands?

Steve: Yes.

Mountain View Park?

Steve: Build your case in the narrative. It could meet the access criteria.

What is the L&WCF grant schedule for FY 03?

Steve: We'll have to wait to see what happens on the SB 144 legislation so we can revise the State L&WCF Manual. We may have to extend the June 30th deadline.

How will the 7% fee work?

Steve: For example, on a \$200,000 project the match would be \$100,000, so you'd need to increase your match to %100,000 (\$100,000 plus 7%).

Applying the 2003 OPSP

Steve Weaver used the revised 2003 OPSP document to score FY 2003 L&WCF projects.

Steve presented his recommendations to fund FY 2003 L&WCF projects to the Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR) on October 14, 2003. Given the NABNR's reaction to Steve's recommendations, it was evident that the revised 2003 OPSP worked well.

Appendix D
2003 OPSP Public Meeting Invitees

AVIL ALMEIDA
NATL ASSOC LATIN AMER
323 N MARYLAND PKWY
LAS VEGAS NV 89101-3130

ALLAN AMBLER
LOVELOCK PAIUTE TRIBE
PO BOX 878
LOVELOCK NV 89419

JEANIE AMICH
FISH LAKE VALLEY PARK
BRD
HC 72 BOX 514
DYER NV 89010

CURTIS ANDERSON
LAS VEGAS PAIUTE TRIBE
ONE PAIUTE DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89106

DEBBIE ANDERSON
LANDER CO PARKS & REC
625 S BROAD ST
BATTLE MTN NV 89820-
1920

ELLEN ANDERSON
CPRP
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

MARY BETH ANDERSON
INCLINE VILLAGE GID
980 INCLINE WAY
INCLINE VILLAGE NV
89451

RICHARD ARNOLD
LAS VEGAS INDIAN CTR
INC
2300 W BONANZA RD
LAS VEGAS NV 89107

LIZ M ARRIOTTI
CENTRAL LYON PARK &
REC
406 BROOKFIELD CT
DAYTON NV 89403

PETER AXELSON
BENEFICIAL DESIGNS
1617 WATER STE B
MINDEN NV 89423

GARY ALAN BACOCK
CITY OF FERNLEY
595 SILVER LACE BLVD
FERNLEY NV 89408

COLLEEN BACON
TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND
PO BOX 1097
MINDEN NV 89423

RICHARD BACUS
PUBLIC WORKS
PO BOX 435
VIRGINIA CITY NV 89440

HALLEMA BAILEY
NRPS
316 E BROOKS AVE
N LAS VEGAS NV 89030

KATHY BAL
50 W WINNEMUCCA BLVD
WINNEMUCCA NV 89445

DALE BARBEAU
CPRP
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

MARIE BARRY
WASHOE TRIBE OF NV &
CA
919 HIGHWAY 395 SOUTH
GARDNERVILLE NV 89410

DARREL BENDER
CARSON COLONY
COUNCIL
2900 S CURRY ST
CARSON CITY NV 89703

ERIKA BENDICKSON
YOUTH & ADULT SPORTS
COMM
298 ARROYO GRANDE
BLVD
HENDERSON NV 89014

PHILLIP BENNETT
WOODFORDS COMM
COUNCIL
96 WASHOE BLVD
MARKLEEVILLE CA 96120

JIM BENTLEY
INDIAN HILLS GID
924-D MICA DR
CARSON CITY NV 89705

MARY LOU BENTLY
WESTERN NV DEVEL DIST
3208 GONI RD STE 183
CARSON CITY NV 89706

WILLIAM BILLS
WINNEMUCCA COLONY
COUNCIL
PO BOX 1370
WINNEMUCCA NV 89446

KEN BLAKE
JACKPOT REC CTR
PO BOX 627
JACKPOT NV 89825

TERRY LYNN BOSTWICK
TOWN OF PAHRUMP
400 N HWY 160
PAHRUMP NV 89048

KEVIN BRADY SR
YOMBA SHOSHONE TRIBE
HC 61 BOX 6275
AUSTIN NV 89310

JESSICA BRETZLAFF
LAS VEGAS SPRINGS PRES
1001 S VALLEY VIEW
LAS VEGAS NV 89153

BETH BROWN
CITY OF CARLIN
PO BOX 787
CARLIN NV 89822

SHERI BROWN
ELKO COUNTY
PO BOX 1521
ELKO NV 89803

JEFF BURNS
HEALTH & FITNESS COMM
8275 SPRING MTN RD
LAS VEGAS NV 89117\

CRAIG BURNSIDE
DOUGLAS CO PARKS &
REC
PO BOX 218
MINDEN NV 89423

DEPT BUSINESS &
INDUSTRY
555 E WASHINGTON AVE
STE 4900
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

ART CAMASEE
ELY SHOSHONE COUNCIL
16 SHOSHONE CIR
ELY NV 89301

RONALD A CARRION
EUREKA CO ECONOMIC
DEVEL
PO BOX 753
EUREKA NV 89316

AMY CRAVER
CPRP
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

CHAIRMAN
LINCOLN CO REC & PARK
PO BOX 275
PIOCHE NV 89043

JOYCE CHEVERINO
8981 S POLARIS
LAS VEGAS NV 89139

CLARK CO PARKS & REC
500 S GRAND CENTRAL
PKWY FL 5
LAS VEGAS NV 89120

CLARK CO COMM CTR
3900 CAMBRIDGE ST STE
105
LAS VEGAS NV 89109

GARY CORDES
CITY OF FALLON
55 W WILLIAMS
FALLON NV 89406

JAMES COX
2763 NEW HOPE DR
GARDNERVILLE NV 89410

NORMA COX
FRIENDS OF DESERT
WTLNDS
718 E FRANKLIN AVE
LAS VEGAS NV 89014

CHIEMI CRAIG

VIRGINIA CITY TOURISM
PO BOX 920
VIRGINIA CITY NV 89440

ANDREA CRAM
STUDENT BRANCH COMM
240 WATER ST
HENDERSON NV 89015

DENNIS CROOKS
CITY OF ELKO
1751 COLLEGE AVE
ELKO NV 89801

WALTER CUCHINE
FACILITIES DIRECTOR
PO BOX 284
EUREKA NV 89316

RACHEL DAHL
LVEA
446 W WILLIAMS
FALLON NV 89406

LACY DALTON
VRWPA
820 CARTWRIGHT RD
RENO NV 89511

GREG DENNIS
PO BOX 1900
RENO NV 89505

DOUG DOOLITTLE
WASHOE CO PARKS & REC
2601 PLUMAS ST
RENO NV 89509

KENNETH DORAN
CLARK CO PARKS
PO BOX 557141
LAS VEGAS NV 89155-7141

JERRY DRAGGOO
MIG INC
412 NW 13TH AVE
PORTLAND OR 97209

BOB DWYER
PROF REGISTRATION
COMM
2601 E SUNSET RD
LAS VEGAS NV 89120

ELY SENIOR CITIZENS CTR
1000 CAMPTON
ELY NV 89301

GABRIELLE ENFIELD
WASHOE CO
1001 E NINTH ST
RENO NV 89520

ROSEMARIE ENTSMINGER
WASHOE CO PARKS & REC
PO BOX 11130
RENO NV 89520-0027

MELANIE EVERHART
ELKO BOARD COUNCIL
511 SUNSET ST
ELKO NV 89801

BLAKE FARRIS
STATE SPECIAL EVENTS
COMM
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

LINDA FEARNLEY
CPRP
240 WATER ST
HENDERSON NV 89015

ANDY FERNANDEZ
THERAPEUTIC COMM
MEMBER
PO BOX 1900
RENO NV 89505

LYNN FORSBERG
JACKPOT TOWN PARK
155 S 9TH ST
ELKO NV 89801

HEATHER GALLO
CONSERVATION DIST OF S
NV
5820 S PECOS RD STE 400
LAS VEGAS NV 89119

BILL GARDNER
WASHOE CO PARKS & REC
2601 PLUMAS ST
RENO NV 89500-0027

RON GREGORY
CLARK CO COMP
PLANNING
500 S GRAND CTRL PKWY
3012
LAS VEGAS NV 89155

KATE GREWE
LEISURE & AGING COMM
6255 W FLAMINGO
LAS VEGAS NV 89103

TERRY GLAESKE
SWINGING SAMS
2450 PARKWAY DR
RENO NV 89502-9586

GOVERNORS CEPD
2501 E SAHARA BLVD STE
104
LAS VEGAS NV 89104

GOVERNORS CEPD
4600 KIETZKE LN STE A125
RENO NV 89502

CANDANCE GRAYMAN
MOAPA BUSINESS
COUNCIL
PO BOX 340
MOAPA NV 89025

JEANNE GRIBBIN
MASTER GARDNERS
ASSOC
1921 LOUSE TOWN RD
RENO NV 89511

DANNY GRIFFITH
ELY PARKS MAINT
PO BOX 299
ELY NV 89301

KEN GRUBB
TOWN OF PAHRUMP
400 N HWY 160
PAHRUMP NV 89060

DEBBIE HARDY
PO BOX 158
OVERTON NV 89040

NORMAN HARRY
PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE
TRIBE
PO BOX 256
NIXON NV 89424

DEAN HAYMORE

ADMIN OF BLDG &
PLANNING
PO BOX 526
VIRGINIA CITY NV 89440

DEE HELMING
AUSTIN CHAMBER OF
COMM
PO BOX 212
AUSTIN NV 89310

JOHN HESTER
WASHOE CO COMP
PLANNING
PO BOX 11130
RENO NV 89520

JOHN HIATT
RED ROCK AUDUBON
SOCIETY
8180 PLACID ST
LAS VEGAS NV 89123

KATHLEEN HILL
TONOPAH CONV/VISITOR
CTR
PO BOX 408
TONOPAH NV 89049

JOEL HODES
SCHURZ ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL
PO BOX 70
SCHURZ NV 89427

JIM HOLLAND
LAKE MEAD NAT'L REC
AREA
601 NEVADA HWY
BOULDER CITY NV 89005

MILTON HOOPER
GOSHUTE BUSINESS
COUNCIL
PO BOX 6104
IBAPAH UT 94034

DENNA L HOWELL
CITY OF MESQUITE
10 E MESQUITE BLVD
MESQUITE NV 89027

LYDIA JOHNSON
BATTLE MTN BAND
COUNCIL
37 MOUNTAIN VIEW DR #C
BATTLE MOUNTAIN NV
89820

MIMI KALB
PARKS & REC DEPT
98 RICHARDS WAY
SPARKS NV 89431

STEVE KASTENS
CARSON CITY PARKS &
REC
3303 BUTTI WAY BLDG 9
CARSON CITY NV 89701

CASEY KELLY
CITY OF ELKO
1751 COLLEGE AVE
ELKO NV 89801

MARK KIMBROUGH
TAHOE RIM TRAIL
948 INCLINE WAY
INCLINE VILLAGE NV
89451

EDGAR KLEINER
MAY ARBORETUM
1502 WASHINGTON
RENO NV 89503

RAQUEL KNECHT
NEVADA HISPANIC
SERVICES
637 S STEWART ST B
CARSON CITY NV 89701

TERI KNIGHT
HIGH DESERT RCD
5820 S PECOS STE A 400
LAS VEGAS NV 89120

DAVE KUIPER
LAS VEGAS PARKS & REC
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

TONY LARSON
GOOD SAM CLUB
209 ANNAPOLIS AVE
CARSON CITY 89703-4531

DAWN MONIQUE LEE
STEWART COMM
COUNCIL
5300 SNYDER AVE
CARSON CITY NV 89701

ESTELA LE VARIO
NEVADA HISPANIC
SERVICES
3905 NEIL RD
RENO NV 89502

JOHN LOETE
RENO LEISURE SERVICES
PO BOX 1900
RENO NV 89505

LORAYN LONDON
TE-MOAK TRIBAL
COUNCIL
525 SUNSET ST
ELKO NV 89801

JOANNE LORREY
PUBLIC COMM
2601 E SUNSET RD
LAS VEGAS NV 89120

LORI LYNCH
CITY OF ELKO
1751 COLLEGE AVE
ELKO NV 89801

CHERYL LYNDE
PLANNING & BUILDING
DEPT
315 S HUMBOLDT ST
BATTLE MOUNTAIN NV
89820

EDITH M MANNING
SHOSHONE-PAIUTE TRIBE
PO BOX 219
OWYHEE NV 89832

NANCY MACCARTNEY
CITY OF RENO PARKS &
REC
1301 VALLEY RD
RENO NV 89512-2228

TAMMY MANZINI
AUSTIN CHAMBER OF
COMM
PO BOX 212
AUSTIN NV 89310

DELOY MARTINEZ

NATL LATINO PEACE OFF
PO BOX 1717
LAS VEGAS NV 89125

JUDY MARTINSON
NRCS
5820 S PECOS RD STE 400
LAS VEGAS NV 89120

JAYNE MAZURKIEWICZ
CITY OF HENDERSON
240 WATER ST
HENDERSON NV 89015

CATHERINE MCCALL
CULTURAL DIVERSITY
COMM
4770 S HARRISON DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89121

JEFF MCCUSKER
NAT'L PARK SERVICE
1111 JACKSON ST STE 700
OAKLAND CA 94607-4807

MARVIN MCDADE
SOUTH FORK BAND
COUNCIL
HC 30 B-13 SPRING CREEK
LEE NV 89815

MCGILL SENIOR CITIZENS
PO BOX 1237
MCGILL NV 89301

LISA MENDEL
PAHRUMP FAIRGROUNDS
900 S MARGARET
PAHRUMP NV 89048

GERALD MILLER
RESOURCE CONS &
DEVELOP
HC-33 BOX 33451
ELY NV 89301

JAMIE MILLS
NV WATER PROT ASSOC
PO BOX 2556
FALLON NV 89407-2556

RONALD L MILLS
NDOW
HCR 10 BOX 10808
ELY NV 89301

JAMES MOORE
CHURCHILL CO PARKS &

REC
325 SHECKLER RD
FALLON NV 89406

MARTY MOROCH
350 DANALDA CT
HENDERSON NV 89014

HELEN MORTENSON
3930 EL CAMINO RD
LAS VEGAS NV 89103

KAREN MULLEN
WASHOE CO PARKS & REC
PO BOX 1130
RENO NV 89520-0027

CLAYTON MYERS
NV BACKCOUNTRY
HORSEMEN
2575 ANTELOPE ST
SILVER SPRINGS NV 89429

SCOTT NEBESKY
RENO SPARKS INDIAN
COLONY
98 COLONY RD
RENO NV 89502

LYNDA SUE NELSON
WASHOE CO PARKS & REC
1502 WASHINGTON ST
RENO NV 89503

MIKE NELSON
2881 HWY 208
WELLINGTON NV 89444

NV OFF OF VETERANS
SRVC
1201 TERMINAL WAY NO
108
RENO NV 89520

NV OFF OF VETERANS
SRVC
155 N TAYLOR STE 166
FALLON NV 89406

NV OFF OF VETERANS
SRVC
1700 VEGAS DR RM 1725
LAS VEGAS NV 89106

NV REC & PARK SOCIETY
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR

LAS VEGAS NV 89101

JIM NORMAN
CITY OF HENDERSON
240 WATER ST
HENDERSON NV 89015

KATHLEEN OLSON
CEPD
4600 KIETZKE LN F154
RENO NV 89502

NEVADA TRAILS
COALITION
HCR 38 BOX 325
LAS VEGAS NV 89124

ERIN O'CONNOR-HENRY
NNECO COORDINATION
CTR
2035 LAST CHANCE RD
ELKO NV 89801-4938

DON ORNDORFF
MINERAL CO PARKS &
REC
PO BOX 1775
HAWTHORNE NV 89415

JIM PARK
TOWN OF GARDNERVILLE
1369 HWY 395 N
GARDNERVILLE NV 89410

NEVADA PENOLI
WELLS BAND COUNCIL
PO BOX 809
WELLS NV 89835

PERSHING BRD COMM
DRAWER E
LOVELOCK NV 89419

LYNN PETRONSKY
PO BOX 61242
BOULDER CITY NV 89006

JANE PIKE
PUBLIC COMM
2601 E SUNSET RD
LAS VEGAS NV 89120

JIM POTTS
NRCS
PO BOX 8
CALIENTE NV 89008

PETE PRIEST
SPEAKER BUR COMM
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

ROBERT QUINTERO
WALKER RIVER PAUTE
TRIBE
PO BOX 220
SCHURZ NV 89427

KAREN RAJALA
WHITE PINE CO EDC
957 CAMPTON ST
ELY NV 89301

RONALD RADIL
WESTERN NV DEVELOP
DIST
3208 GONI RD STE 183
CARSON CITY NV 89706-
0722

JANET REEVES
NEVADA URBAN INDIANS
INC
1190 BIBLE WAY
RENO NV 89502

WES REID
KEEP TRUCKEE MDWS
BEAUT
PO BOX 7412
RENO NV 89510

MYRLE RICE
INTERTECH SERVICE
CORP
8712 HEATHERSTONE ST
HENDERSON NV 89014

STEPHANIE RICHARD
ARPS PROG COMM
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

LAURA RICHARDS
NDOW
1100 VALLEY RD
RENO NV 89502

KENNETH ROBERTS
YERINGTON TRIBAL
COUNCIL
171 CAMPBELL LN
YERINGTON NV 89447

PHYLLIS ROBISTOW
LINCOLN CO GRANT
ADMIN
PO BOX 539
PIOCHE NV 89043

AL ROGERS
CPRP
PO BOX 1900
RENO NV 89505

BRIAN ROSS
12830 17TH ST
REDLANDS CA 92373

STEPHEN ROWLAND
CITIZENS FOR ACTIVE
MGMT
5541 SURREY ST
LAS VEGAS NV 89119

GILLIAN RYMEN
RENO SPARKS INDIAN
COLONY
98 COLONY RD
SPARKS NV 89502

ROBERT SAM
SUMMIT LAKE PAUTE
TRIBE
655 ANDERSON ST
WINNEMUCCA NV 89445

VIRGINIA SANCHEZ
DUCKWATER SHOSHONE
TRIBE
PO BOX 140068
DUCKWATER NV 89314

KURT SAWYER
CITY OF MESQUITE
10 E MESQUITE BLVD
MESQUITE NV 89027

ED SCHENK
RENO PARK REC & COMM
SERV
2055 IDLEWILD DR
RENO NV 89509

JULIE SCHEVE
VOLUNTEER
COORDINATOR
PO BOX 7412
RENO NV 89510-7412

DONALD SCHMEISER
CITY OF LAS VEGAS
731 S FOURTH ST
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

JAIME SCHROEDER
RENO CITY PARKS & REC
1301 VALLEY RD
RENO NV 89512

ROBEN SELLERS
2090 CLEAR ACRE LN
RENO NV 89512

SENIOR CITIZEN PRG DIV
749 VETERANS MEMORIAL
DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

MOIRA CASEY SHEA
WASHOE CO PARKS & REC
2601 PLUMAS ST
RENO NV 89520

BRUCE SILLITOE
CLARK CO PARKS &
COMM SRV
2601 E SUNSET RD
LAS VEGAS NV 89120-3515

DAROLYN SKELTON
LAKE TAHOE
SHAKESPEARE
PO BOX 3457
INCLINE VILLAGE NV
89450

DENNIS SMART
FT MCDERMITT TRIBES
PO BOX 457
MCDERMITT NV 89421

ANTHONY SMOKEY
DRESSLERVILLE COMM
COUN
1585 WATASHEAMU DR
GARDNERVILLE NV 89410

CHRISTINA SOWINSKI
SCHOLARSHIPS COMM
3930 CAMBRIDGE ST
LAS VEGAS NV 89119

PATRICIA SULLIVAN
BOULDER CITY PARKS &
REC
801 ADAMS BLVD
BOULDER NV 89005

JOLENE M SUPP
CITY OF WELLS
PO BOX 366
WELLS NV 89835-0366

DAN TARWATER
2200 CIVIC CTR DR
N LAS VEGAS NV 89030

DIANA TAVARAS
CITY OF FALLON
55 W. WILLIAMS AVE
FALLON NV 89406

TONY TAYLOR
CITY OF N LAS VEGAS
316 E BROOKS AVE
N LAS VEGAS NV 89030

MARSHAL TAYLOR
CITY OF N LAS VEGAS
316 E BROOKS AVE
N LAS VEGAS NV 89030

KEN TEDFORD
CITY OF FALLON
55 W. WILLIAMS AVE
FALLON NV 89406

JOHN TENNERT
LV WATER DIST
1001 S VALLEY VIEW
BLVD
LAS VEGAS NV 89153

TOWN CLERK
TOWN OF JACKPOT
PO BOX 337
JACKPOT NV 89825

SANDY TSCHUMPERLIN
PARKS & REC
3303 BUTTI WAY BLDG 9
CARSON CITY NV 89701

ANDREA TURMAN
PO BOX 1057
VIRGINIA CITY NV 89440

DARREN UHL
CULTURAL DIVERSITY
COMM
1330 S MCLEOD
LAS VEGAS NV 89121

JEFF VAN EE
NV WILDLIFE
FEDERATION
2092 HERITAGE OAKS
LAS VEGAS NV 89119

GLEN VAN ROEKEL
CALIENTE PUBLIC WORKS
PO BOX 1006
CALIENTE NV 89008-1006

KIMBERLY RAE VILT
CONSERV DIST OF S NV
5820 S PECOS RD A-400
LAS VEGAS NV 89120

DIANA WAGNER
FERNLEY PTA
450 HARDY LN
FERNLEY NV 89408

MARY ANN WAINWRIGHT
CPRP
5712 MISSOURI
LAS VEGAS NV 89122

MARK WARREN
DIVISION OF WILDLIFE
1100 VALLEY RD
RENO NV 89512-2817

WENDOVER USA
PO BOX 3710
WENDOVER NV 89883-3710

D STEPHEN WEST
CITY OF WINNEMUCCA
90 W FOURTH ST
WINNEMUCCA NV 89445

LARRY WHITE
CITY OF FALLON
55 W. WILLIAMS AVE
FALLON NV 89406

CHARLES WILLIAMS
CITY OF ELKO
1751 COLLEGE AVE
ELKO NV 89801

WILBUR WOODS
ELKO BAND COUNCIL
511 SUNSET ST
ELKO NV 89801

PETER ZAVATTARO
FRDS DESERT WETLANDS
PRK
7371 MISSION HILLS DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89113-1316

TERRY ZELLER
CITY OF RENO PAKS &
REC
2055 IDLEWILD DR
RENO NV 89505

LONNY ZIMMERMAN
CPRP
749 VETERAMS
MEMORIAL DR
LAS VEGAS NV 89101

KIM ZUKOSKY
LV VALLEY WATER DIST
1001 S VALLEY VIEW
BLVD
LAS VEGAS NV 89153

Appendix E
2003 OPSP Public Meetings Attendance Roster

2003 OPSP Public Meetings Attendance Roster

Las Vegas Meeting on March 21, 2003, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon					
Mr.	John	Tennert	Assistant Management Analyst	Las Vegas Valley Water District	Las Vegas
Ms.	Jessica	Bretzlaff	Consultant Grant Writer	Las Vegas Springs Preserve	Las Vegas
Ms.	Hallema	Bailey	Recreational Programmer	NRPS/North Las Vegas Parks & Recreation	North Las Vegas
Mr.	Peter	Zavattaro	Trustee	Friends of the Desert Wetlands Park	Las Vegas
Mr.	Bruce	Sillitoe	Principal Planner	Clark County Parks & Community Services	Las Vegas
Ms.	Joyce	Cheverino	Board of Directors	Henderson Flag Football League	Las Vegas
Ms.	Teri	Knight	Coordinator	High Desert RCD, NRCS, USDA Service Center	Las Vegas
Reno Meeting on March 27, 2003, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon					
Mr.	Edwin	Schenk	Park Planning Manager	City of Reno Parks, Recreation and Community Services	Reno
Mr.	Terry	Zeller	Park Development Planner	City of Reno Parks, Recreation and Community Services	Reno
Ms.	Rosemarie	Entsminger	Physical Compliance Officer	Washoe County Parks and Recreation	Reno
Mr.	Bill	Gardner	Park Planner	Washoe County Parks and Recreation	Reno
Carson City Meeting on April 4, 2003, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon					
Mr.	Ronald	Radil	Project Developer	Western Nevada Development District	Carson City
Mr.	Vern	Krahn	Park Planner	Carson City Park & Recreation Department	Carson City
Ms.	Colleen	Bacon	Project Manager	The Trust for Public Land, Western Region	Minden
Ms.	Jamie	Mills	Executive Director	Newlands Water Protection Association	Fallon
Ely Meeting on April 7, 2003, 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.					
Ms.	Karen	Rajala	Coordinator	White Pine County Economic Diversification Council	Ely
Mr.	Danny	Griffith	Ely Parks & Recreation Maintenance Director	City of Ely	Ely
Elko Meeting on April 8, 2003, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.					
Mr.	Dennis	Crooks	City Planner	City of Elko Planning Department	Elko
Mr.	Casey	Kelly	City Staff Engineer	City of Elko	Elko
Ms.	Sheri	Brown	Elko County Commissioner	Elko County	Elko
Mr.	Lynn	Forsberg	Public Works Director	Elko County	Elko

Appendix F
Samples of 2003 OPSP Public Meeting Materials

March 5, 2003

TO: Persons Interested in federal Land & Water Conservation Fund Grants

You are cordially invited and encouraged to attend one of the five public meetings announced on the enclosed Notice of Public Meetings announcement. The Nevada Division of State Parks will conduct the meetings across Nevada from March 21, 2003, through April 8, 2003. The purpose of the meetings is to receive public input on the Open Project Selection Process (OPSP), which determines the grant application selection process and scoring criteria. If you cannot attend one of the meetings, please send someone to represent you. You may also invite others to attend. Those who will benefit most from the meetings are those whose entity is eligible to submit requests for federal Land & Water Conservation Fund (L&WCF) grants.

The agenda is the same for each of the five scheduled meetings. Please note that the starting times do vary. Each meeting is scheduled for a maximum of three hours. Participants will have an opportunity to provide input to revise the Open Project Selection Process (OPSP). The OPSP is revised about once every five years. This is your opportunity to acquaint yourself with, and help determine, the process and criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of L&WCF Grant moneys in Nevada in the upcoming years.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact:

Mr. Jim DeLoney
Park and Recreation Program Manager
Nevada Division of State Parks
1300 South Curry Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703-5202
775-687-1694 Voice
775-687-4117 Fax
jdeloney@parks.nv.gov Email

Mr. Steve Weaver
Chief of Planning and Development
Nevada Division of State Parks
1300 South Curry Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703-5202
775-687-1693 Voice
775-687-4117 Fax
jsweaver@parks.nv.gov Email

We look forward to seeing you or your representative at one of the meetings.

Sincerely,

James A. DeLoney
Park & Recreation Program Manager

J. Stephen Weaver
Chief of Planning and Development

JAD/JSW/jad

Enclosure: as

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

Open Project Selection Process Public Input Meetings

Conducted by the Nevada Division of State Parks

Purpose of Meetings: To receive public input on the Open Project Selection Process (OPSP). The OPSP cites the process and criteria used by the Nevada Division of State Parks to accept, score, and rank Land & Water Conservation Fund Projects submitted for federal funding assistance to acquire and develop parks and recreation areas in Nevada. Five public meetings will be held as shown below.

March 21, 2003 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 Noon Training Room # 1 Clark County Government Center 500 South Grand Central Parkway Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 Host: Chris Knight, Las Vegas Planning and Development	April 7, 2003 2:00-5:00 P.M. Conference Room, White Pine County Library 950 Campton Street Ely, NV 89301 Host: Karen Rajala, White Pine Economic Diversification Council
March 27, 2003 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 Noon Board Room, McKinley Arts & Culture Center 925 Riverside Drive (No parking here) Reno, NV 89503 Host: Ed Schenk, Reno Parks, Recreation & Community Services @ 775-334-2527 Voice or Schenk@ci.reno.nv.us Email. Parking—80 West to Keystone Exit, Left to Jones, turn left, parking to right. Questions—call Ed Schenk.	April 8, 2003 10:00 A.M.-1:00 P.M. Timberline Room Elko Convention & Visitors Authority 700 Moren Way Elko, NV 89801 Host: Ralph McMullen, Elko Convention & Visitors Authority
April 4, 2003 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 Noon Room 217, Dept. of Cons. & Natural Resources 123 West Nye Lane Carson City, NV 89706 Host: Steve Kastens, Carson City Parks & Recreation Department	

Agenda

- Call to order—Introductions—Conduct of Meeting
- Open Project Selection Process
- 2003 SCORP Issues/Actions Update Status
- FY 2003 Land and Water Conservation Funding Status
- FY 2003 Grant Cycle Timetable
- SB 144 (L&WCF Administration Costs)
- Public Input/Comments on L&WCF Evaluation Criteria
- Break
- Public Input/Comments on L&WCF Evaluation Criteria
- Summary and Wrap-Up
- Adjourn

NOTES: Agenda items may be taken out of order.

Nevada State Parks will make reasonable efforts to assist and accommodate people with disabilities who wish to attend the meeting. If special accommodations are necessary, please contact Jim DeLoney, Nevada State Parks at (775) 687-1694.

This agenda was posted at each of the five locations cited above, and at the Nevada Division of State Parks Headquarters, 1300 South Curry Street, Carson City. It was faxed for posting to each Regional Office of Nevada State Parks and can be found on Nevada State Parks website at <http://parks.nv.gov>.

March 6, 2003

Mr. Chris Knight
Deputy Director, Las Vegas Planning and Development
731 South Fourth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Dear Mr. Knight:

Chris, thanks for the assistance you and Pam provided to make the arrangements for the upcoming Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) Meeting in Las Vegas on March 21, 2003. Thanks to you also for serving as the host.

I'm enclosing a copy of the letter and notice we mailed this morning to 138 potential participants across the state asking them to attend one of the five meetings listed on the notice. Two extra copies of the notice are enclosed. Would you please give one copy to Pam? Pam said she would see that one notice is posted on a prominent bulletin board in the Clark County Government Center. If you could have someone post the second copy on a prominent bulletin board in your office building, I would appreciate it.

If you or Pam have any questions, please contact me at 775-687-1694 voice, at 775-687-4117 email, or jdeloney@parks.nv.gov.

Sincerely,

James A. DeLoney
Park and Recreation Program Manager

JAD/jad

Enclosures: as (See previous two pages—author)

